

2
HISTORY

NATIONAL LIBRARY
CANADA
BIBLIO. DE NATIONALE



OF THE

VATICAN COUNCIL,

TOGETHER WITH THE LATIN AND ENGLISH TEXT

OF THE

PAPAL SYLLABUS AND THE VATICAN DECREES,

FROM THE FORTHCOMING "HISTORY OF THE CREEDS OF
CHRISTENDOM."

BY THE

REV. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

PRICE 20 CENTS.

1
TORONTO:

A. S. IRVING & CO., PUBLISHERS,
NO. 4 UNION BLOCK AND 85 KING STREET WEST,
1875.

HISTORY

BX 830

1869

S2

4972

fen
En
to
C
Civ
Dev
R
Pet
(ti)
C
celu
Par
tran
M
cile
des
H
paia
W
Con
in f
D
d. 1
F
Fre
Pop
D
in E
the
prob
Univ
D
Eng
Re
Conc
Fe
lated
to w
of th

HISTORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

LITERATURE.

I. WORKS PRECEDING THE COUNCIL.

Officielle Actenstücke zu dem von Sr. Heiligkeit dem Papste Pius IX. nach Rom berufenen Oekumenischen Concile, Berlin, 1869 (pp. 189). This work contains the Papal Encyclicals of 1864, and the various papal letters and official documents preparatory to the Council, in Latin and German.

Chronique concernant le Prochain Concile. Traduction revue et approuvée de la Civiltà cattolica par la correspondance de Rome, Vol. I. Avant le Concile. Rome, Deuxième ed. 1869, fol. (pp. 192). Begins with the Papal letter of June 26, 1867.

HENRY EDWARD MANNING (Archbishop of Westminster): *The Centenary of St. Peter and the General Council. A Pastoral Letter*. London, 1867. Also in Italian (*tipog. della Civiltà cattolica*). In favour of Infallibility.

C. H. A. PLANTIER (Bishop of Nîmes): *Sur les Conciles généraux à l'occasion de celui que Sa Sainteté Pie IX. a convoqué pour le 8 décembre prochain*, Nîmes, et Paris, 1869. The same in German: *Ueber die allgemeinen Kirchenversammlungen*, translated by Th. von Lamezan, Freiberg im Breisgau, 1869. Infallibilist.

MAGR. VICT. AUG. DECHAMPS (Archbishop of Malines): *L'Infaillibilité et le Concile général*, 2d ed., Paris et Malines, 1869. German translation: *Die Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes und das Allgemeine Concil*, Mainz, 1869. Strong Infallibilist.

H. L. C. MARET (Dean of Theol. Faculty of Paris): *Du Concile général et de la paix religieuse*, Paris, 1869, 2 vols. Against Infallibility. Has since recanted.

W. EMMANUEL FREIHERR VON KETTELER (Bishop of Mayence): *Das Allgemeine Concil und seine Bedeutung für unsere Zeit*, 4th ed. Mainz, 1869. First against, now in favour of Infallibility.

DR. JOSEPH FESSLER (Bishop of St. Polten and Secretary of the Vatican Council, d. 1872): *Das letzte und das nächste Allgemeine Concil*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1869.

F. DUFAUCLUP (Bishop of Orleans): *Lettre sur le futur Concile Œcumenique*, in French, German, and other languages, 1869. The same on the *Infallibility of the Pope*. First against, and then in favor of the new dogma.

Der Papst und das Concil von JANUS, Leipzig, 1869. Several additions. The same in English: *The Pope and the Council*, by JANUS, London, 1869. In opposition to the Jesuit programme of the Council, from the liberal (old) Catholic stand-point; probably the joint production of Profs. DOLLINGER, FRIEDRICH, and HUBER, of the University of Munich.

DR. J. HERGENROTHER (B. C.); *Anti-Janus*, Freiburg in Breisgau, 1870. Also in English, by J. B. ROBERTSON, Dublin, 1870.

Reform der Rom. Kirche in Haupt und Gliedern Aufgabe des bevorstehenden Rom. Concils, Leipz. 1869. [By Prof. von SHULTE, of Prague.] Liberal Catholic.

FELIX BUNOERNER (Prot): *Rome and the Council in the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the French, with additions by the Author*. Edinb. 1870. (Conjectures as to what the Council will be, to judge from the Papal Syllabus and the past history of the Papacy.)

II. REPORTS DURING THE COUNCIL.

The *Civiltà cattolica* of Rome, for 1869 and 1870. Chief organ of the Jesuits and Infallibilists.

LOUIS VEUILLOT: *Rome pendant le Concile*, Paris, 1870, 2 vols. Collection of his correspondence to his journal, *l'Univers*, of Paris. Ultra-Infallibilist and utterly unscrupulous.

J. FRIEDRICH (Prof. Church History in Munich, lib. Cath.): *Tagebuch während des Vaticanischen Concils geführt*, Noddingen, 1871. A journal kept during the Council, and noting the facts, projects, and rumours as they came to the surface. The author, a colleague and intimate friend of Dollinger, has since been excommunicated.

LORD ACTON (liberal Catholic): *Zur Geschichte des Vatican Concils*, first published in the *North British Review* for October, 1870, (under the title: *The Vatican Council*, pp. 95-120 of the Amer. reprint), translated by Dr. Reischl, at Munich, 1871.

QUIRINUS: *Letters from Rome on the Council*, first in Augsb. *Allgemeine Zeitung*, and then in a separate volume, Munich, 1870; also in English, London, 1870 (pp. 866). Letters of three liberal Catholics, of different nations, who had long resided in Rome, and, during the Council, communicated to each other all the information they could gather from members of the Council, and sent their letters to a friend in Germany for publication in the *Augsburg General Gazette*.

Compare against Quirinus: *Die Unwahrheiten der Römischen Briefe vom Concil in der Allg. Zeitung*, von W. EMMANUEL FREIHERRN VON KETTELER (Bishop of Mayence), 1870.

Ce qui se passe au Concile. Dated April 16, 1870. Troisième ed. Paris, 1870. [By JULES GAILLARD.]

La dernière heure du Concile, Paris, 1870. [By a member of the Council.] The last two works were denounced as a calumny by the presiding Cardinals in the session, July 16, 1870.

Also the Reports during the Council in the *Giornale di Roma*, the *Turin Unita cattolica*, the *London Times*, the *London (R.C.) Tablet*, the *Dublin Review*, the *New York Tribune*, and other leading periodicals.

III. THE ACTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL.

(1.) Roman Catholic (Infallibilist) Sources.

Acta et Decreta sacrosancti et œumenici Concilii Vaticani die 8 Dec. 1869 a ss. D. N. Pio IX. inchoati. Cum permissione superiorum, Friburgi Brisgovie, 1871, in 2 parts. The first part contains the Papal Encyclicals with the Syllabus and the acts preparatory to the Council: the second, the public acts of the council itself, with a list of the dioceses of the Roman Church and the members of the Vatican Council.

Actes et histoire du Concile œumenique de Rome, premier du Vatican, ed. under the auspices of *Victor Frond*, Paris, 1869, sqq. 6 vols. Includes extensive biographies of Pope Pius IX. and his Cardinals, etc., with portraits. Vol. VI. contains the *Actes, decrets et documents recueillis et mis en ordre par M. Pelletier, chanoine d'Orléans*. Each vol. costs 100 francs.

Atti ufficiali del Concilio œumenico, Torino, pp. 682 (? 1870).

Officielle Actenstücke zu dem von Sr. Heiligkeit dem Papst Pius IX. nach Rom berufenen Œkumenischen Concil, Zweite Sammlung, Berlin, 1870.

Das Œkumenische Concil. Stimmen aus Maria-Laach, Neue Folge. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1870. A series of discussions in defense of the Council by Jesuits (Florian Riess, and K. v. Weber).

HENRY EDWARD MANNING (R. C. Archbishop of Westminster): *The Vatican Council and its Definitions. A Pastoral Letter to his Clergy*. London and New York, 1871. A defense of the two Constitutions of the Council *de fide* and *de ecclesia*. This, together with two other Pastoral Letters on the Council (quoted p. 134), are also published in one volume under the joint title *Petri Privilegium*, London, 1871.

Bp. JOS. FESSLER (Secretary of the Vatican Council): *Das Vaticanische Concil, dessen aussere Bedeutung und innerer Verlauf*, Wien, 1871.

The stenographic reports of the speeches of the Council are still locked up in the archives of the Vatican.

(2.) Old Catholic (anti-Infallibilist).

JOH. FRIEDRICH: *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni 1870*, Nordlingen, 1871, in 2 Parts. Contains official and unofficial documents bearing on the Council and the various *schemata de fide, de ecclesia*, etc. Compare his *Tagebuch während des Vaticanischen Concils geführt*, above quoted, and his *Zur Verteidigung meines Tagebuchs. Offener Brief an P. R. Cornely, Priester der Gesellschaft Jesu*, Nordl. 1872.

JOH. FRIEDRICH RITTER VON SCHULTE (Prof. of Canon Law in the University of Prague, now in Bonn): *Das Unfehlbarkeitsdecret vom 18 Juli 1870 . . . geprüft*, Prag, 1871. Also, *Die Macht der Rom. Papste über Fürsten, Lander, Völker, Individuen*, etc., Prag, 2d ed. 1871.

Stimmen aus der katholischen Kirche über die Kirchenfragen der Gegenwart, München, 1870 sqq. 2 vols. A series of discussions against the Vatican Council, by DOLLINGER, HUBER, SCHMITZ, FRIEDRICH, RHINKENS, and HOTZL.

(3.) Protestant.

DR. EMIL FRIEDBERG (Prof. of Ecclesiastical Law in Leipzig): *Sammlung der Actenstücke zum ersten Vaticanischen Concil, mit einem Grundriss der Geschichte desselben*, Tübingen, 1872 (pp. 954). Very valuable; contains all the important documents, and a full list of works on the Council.

THEOD. FROMMANN (Privatdocent in Berlin): *Geschichte und Kritik des Vaticanischen Concils von 1869 und 1870*, Gotha, 1872 (pp. 529).

E. DE PRESSENSE (Ref. Pastor in Paris): *Le Concile du Vatican, son histoire et ses consequences politiques et religieuses*, Paris, 1872. Also in German, by Fabarius, Nordlingen, 1872.

L. W. BACON: *An Inside View of the Vatican Council*, New York, 1872 (Amer. Tract Society). Contains a translation of Archbishop Kenrick's speech against Infallibility, with a sketch of the Council, and several documents.

An extensive criticism on the Infallibility decree in the third addition of Dr. HASE's *Handbuch der Protestant. Polemik gegen die römisch-katholische Kirche*, Leipz. 1871, pp. 155-200. Comp. pp. 24-37.

[The above are only the most important works of the large and increasing literature, historical, apologetic, and polemic, on the Vatican Council. A Erlecke, in a pamphlet, *Die Literatur des rom. Concils*, gives a list of over 200 books and pamphlets which appeared in Germany alone till the close of 1870. Friedberg notices in all no less than 1,041 writings on the subject till June, 1872. His lists are classified and very accurate.]

More than three hundred years after the close of the Council of Trent, Pope Pius IX., who had proclaimed the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception, who in the presence of five hundred Bishops had celebrated the eighteenth centennial of the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul, and who was permitted to survive not only the golden wedding of his priesthood, but even—alone among his more than two hundred and fifty predecessors—the silver wedding of his popedom (thus falsifying the tradition "*non videbit annos Petri*"), resolved to convoke a new oecumenical Council, which was to proclaim his own infallibility in all matters of faith and discipline, and thus to put the top-stone to the pyramid of the Roman hierarchy.

He first intimated his intention, June 26, 1867, in an Allocution to five hundred Bishops who were assembled at the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome. The Bishops, in a most humble and obsequious response, July 1, 1867, approved of his heroic courage, to employ, in his old age, an extreme measure for an extreme danger, and predicted a new splendor of the Church, and a new triumph of the kingdom of God. Whereupon the Pope announced to them that he would convene the Council

under the special auspices of the immaculate Virgin, who had crushed the serpent's head and was mighty to destroy alone all the heresies of the world.

The call was issued by an Encyclical, commencing *Aeterni Patris Unigenitus Filius*, in the twenty-third year of his Pontificate, on the feast of St. Peter and Paul, June 29, 1868. It created at once a universal commotion in the Christian world, and called forth a multitude of books and pamphlets even before the Council convened. The highest expectations were suspended by the Pope and his sympathizers on the coming event. What the Council of Trent had effected against the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, the Council of the Vatican was to accomplish against the more radical and dangerous foes of modern liberalism and rationalism, which threatened to undermine Romanism itself in its own strongholds. It was to crush the power of infidelity, and to settle all that belongs to the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Church, and the eternal salvation of souls. It was even hoped that the Council might become a general feast of reconciliation of divided Christendom; and hence the Greek schismatics, and the Protestant heretics and other non-Catholics, were invited by two special letters of the Pope (Sept. 8, and Sept. 13, 1868) to return on this auspicious occasion to "the only sheepfold of Christ," for the salvation of their souls.

But the Eastern Patriarchs spurned the invitation, as an insult to their time-honoured rights and traditions, from which they could not depart. The Protestant communions either ignored or respectfully declined it.

Thus the Vatican Council, like that of Trent, turned out to be simply a general Roman Council, and apparently put the prospect of a reunion of Christendom farther off than ever before.

While these sanguine expectations of Pius IX. were doomed to disappointment, the chief object of the Council was attained, in spite of the strong opposition of the minority of liberal Catholics. This object, which for reasons of propriety is omitted in the bull of convocation and other preliminary acts, but clearly stated by the organs of the Ultramontane or Jesuitical party, was nothing less than the proclamation of the personal *Infallibility of the Pope*, as a binding article of the Roman Catholic faith for all time to come. Herein lies the whole importance of the Council; all the rest dwindles into insignificance, and could never have justified its convocation.

After extensive and careful preparations, the first (and perhaps the last) Vatican Council was solemnly opened amid the sound of innumerable bells and the cannon of St. Angelo, but under frowning skies and a pouring rain, on the festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Dec. 8, 1869, in the Basilica of the Vatican. It reached its height at the fourth public session, July 18, 1870, when the decree of Papal Infallibility was proclaimed. After this it dragged on a sickly existence till October 20, 1870, when it was adjourned till Nov. 11, 1870, but indefinitely postponed on account of the extraordinary change in the political situation of Europe. For on the second of September the French Empire, which had been the main support of the temporal power of the Pope, collapsed with the surrender of Napoleon III., at the old Huguenot stronghold of Sedan, to the Protestant King William of Prussia, and on the twentieth of September the Italian troops, in the name of King Victor Emanuel, took possession of Rome, as the future capital of united Italy. Whether the Council will ever be convened again to complete its vast labors, like the twice interrupted Council of Trent, remains to be seen. But, in proclaiming the personal Infallibility of the Pope, it made all future œcumenical Councils unnecessary for the definition of dogmas and the regulation of discipline, so that hereafter they will be expensive luxuries and

empty ritualistic shows. The acts of the Vatican Council, as far as they go, are irrevocable.

The attendance was larger than that of any of its eighteen predecessors, and presented an imposing array of hierarchical dignity and power such as the world never saw before, and as the Eternal City itself is not likely ever to see again. What a contrast this to the first Council of the apostles, elders, and brethren in an upper chamber in Jerusalem! The whole number of prelates of the Roman Catholic Church, who are entitled to a seat in an œcumenical Council, is one thousand and thirty-seven. Of these there were present at the opening of the Council 719, viz: 49 Cardinals, 9 Patriarchs, 4 Primates, 121 Archbishops, 479 Bishops, 67 Abbots and Generals of monastic orders. This number afterwards increased to 764, viz: 49 Cardinals, 10 Patriarchs, 4 Primates, 105 diocesan Archbishops, 22 Archbishops in partibus infidelium, 424 diocesan Bishops, 98 Bishops in partibus, and 52 Abbots and Generals of Monastic orders. Distributed according to continents, 541 of these belonged to Europe, 88 to Asia, 14 to Africa, 118 to America, 13 to Oceania. At the proclamation of the decree of Papal Infallibility, July 18, 1870, the number was reduced to 585, and afterwards it dwindled down to 200 or 180.

Among the many nations represented, the Italians had a vast majority of 276, of whom 148 belonged to the former Papal States alone. France, with a much larger Catholic population, had only 84, Austria and Hungary 48, Spain 41, Great Britain 35, Germany 19, the United States 48, Mexico 10, Switzerland 8, Belgium 6, Holland 4, Portugal 2, Russia 1. The disproportion between the representatives of the different nations and the number of their constituents was overwhelmingly in favour of Papal influence. More than one half of the Fathers were entertained during the Council at the expense of the Pope.

The Romans themselves were remarkably indifferent to the Council, though keenly alive to the financial gain which the dogma of the Infallibility of their sovereign would bring to the Eternal City and the impoverished Papal treasury. It is well known how soon after the Council they voted almost in a body against the temporal power of the Pope, and for their new master.

The strictest secrecy was enjoined upon the members of the Council. The stenographic reports of the proceedings were locked up in the archives. The world was only to know the final results as proclaimed in the public sessions, until it should please the Roman court to issue an official history. But the freedom of the press in the nineteenth century, the elements of discord in the Council itself, the enterprise or indiscretion of members and friends of both parties, frustrated the precautions. The principal facts, documents, speeches, plans, and intrigues leaked out in the official *schemata*, the controversial pamphlets of Prelates, and the private reports and letters of outside observers who were in intimate and constant intercourse with their friends in the Council.

The subject-matter for deliberation was divided into four parts: on Faith, Discipline, Religious Orders, and on Rites, including Missions. Each part was assigned to a special Commission (*Congregatio* or *Deputatio*), consisting of 24 Prelates elected by ballot for the whole period of the Council, with a presiding Cardinal appointed by the Pope. These Commissions prepared the decrees on the basis of *schemata* previously drawn up by learned divines and canonists, and confidentially submitted to the Bishops in print. The decrees were then discussed, revised, and adopted in secret sessions by the General Congregation (*Congregationes generales*), including all the Fathers, with five presiding Cardinals appointed by the Pope. The General Congregation held eighty-nine sessions in all. Finally, the decrees thus matured

were voted upon by simple yeas or nays (*Placet* or *Non Placet*), and solemnly promulgated in public sessions in the presence and by the authority of the Pope. A conditional assent (*Placet juxta modum*) was allowed in the secret but not in the public sessions.

There were only four such public sessions held during the ten months of the Council, viz., the opening session (lasting nearly seven hours), Dec. 8, 1869, which was a mere formality, but of a ritualistic splendor and magnificence such as can be gotten up nowhere on earth but in St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome; the second session, Jan. 6, 1870, when the Fathers simply professed each one before the Pope the Nicene Creed and the Profession of the Tridentine Faith; the third session, April 24, 1870, when the dogmatic constitution on the Catholic faith was unanimously adopted; and the fourth session, July 18, 1870, when the first dogmatic constitution on the Church of Christ and the Infallibility of the Pope was adopted with two dissenting votes.

The management of the Council was entirely in the hands of the Pope and his dependent Cardinals and Jesuitical advisers. He originated the topics which were to be acted on; he selected the preparatory committees of theologians (mostly of the Ultramontane school) who, during the winter of 1868-69, drew up the *schemata*; he appointed the presiding officers of the four Deputations, and of the General Congregation; and he proclaimed the decrees in his own name, "with the approval of the Council." He provided, by the bull "*Cum Romanis Pontificibus*," of Dec. 4, 1869, for the immediate suspension and adjournment of the Council in case of his death. He even personally interfered during the proceedings in favor of his new dogma by praising Infallibilists, and by ignoring or rebuking anti-Infallibilists. The discussion could be virtually arrested by the presiding Cardinals at the request of only ten members; we say virtually, for although it required a vote of the Council, a majority was always sure. The revised order of business, issued Feb. 22, 1870, departed even from the old rule requiring absolute or at least moral unanimity in definitions of faith (according to the celebrated canon *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est*), and substituted for it a mere numerical majority, in order to secure the triumph of the Infallibility decree in spite of a powerful minority. Nothing could be printed in Rome against Infallibility, while the organs of Infallibility had full freedom to print and publish what they pleased. Such prominence of the Pope is characteristic of a Council convoked for the very purpose of proclaiming his personal infallibility, but is without precedent in history (except in some mediæval Councils); even the Council of Trent maintained its own dignity and comparative independence by declaring its decrees in its own name.

This want of freedom of the Council—not to speak of the strict police surveillance over the members—was severely censured by liberal Catholics. More than one hundred Prelates of all nations signed a strong protest (dated Rome, March 1, 1870) against the order of business, especially against the mere majority vote, and expressed the fear that in the end the authority of this Council might be impaired as wanting in truth and liberty—a calamity so direful in these uneasy times, that a greater could not be imagined. But this protest, like all the acts of the minority, was ignored.

The proceedings were, of course, in the official language of the Roman Church, which all Prelates could understand and speak, but very few with sufficient ease to do justice to themselves and their subjects. The acoustic defects of the Council-hall and the difference of pronunciation proved a great inconvenience, and the Continentals complained that they could not understand the English Latin. The Council had a full share of ignorance and superstition, and was disgraced by intrigues and occasional outbursts of in-

toler
even
eloqu
Upon
chara
be re
Coun

The
Papal
tween
funda
Episc
it com
opinio
which
say n
Churc

But
to a
the P
excite
and S
with a
bility,
well a
haste

For
than t
city w
von S
becaus
and m
Bishop
as the
either
destro
of tru
manis
intima
than t
people
Christi
be the
light o

THE
Thre
—one
Christi
was in
paratio
of the
Catech
power
encoun

tolerance and passion such as are, alas! not unusual in deliberative assemblies even of the Christian Church. But it embraced also much learning and eloquence, especially on the part of the French and German Bishops. Upon the whole, it compares favorably, as to intellectual ability, moral character, and far-reaching effect, with preceding Roman Councils, and must be regarded as the greatest event in the history of the Papacy since the Council of Trent.

The chief importance of the Council of the Vatican lies in its decree on Papal supremacy and Infallibility. It settled the internal dissensions between Ultramontaniam and Gallicanism, which struck at the root of the fundamental principle of authority; it destroyed the independence of the Episcopate, and made it a tool of the Primacy; it crushed liberal Catholicism; it completed the system of Papal absolutism; it raised the hitherto disputed opinion of Papal Infallibility to the dignity of a binding article of faith, which no Catholic can deny without loss of salvation. The Pope may now say not only, "I am the tradition" (*La tradizione son io*), but also, "I am the Church" (*L'Eglise c'est moi*).

But this very triumph of absolutism marks also a new departure. It gave rise to a secession headed by the ablest divines of the Roman Church. It put the Papacy into direct antagonism to the liberal tendencies of the age. It excited the hostility of civil government in all those countries where Church and State are united on the basis of a concordat with the Roman See. No State with any degree of self-respect can treat with a sovereign who claims infallibility, and therefore unconditional submission in matters of moral duty as well as of faith. In reaching the summit of its power, the Papacy has hastened its downfall.

For Protestants and Greeks the Vatican Council is no more œcumenical than that of Trent, and has only intensified the antagonism. Its œcumenicity was also denied by such eminent Roman Catholic scholars as Dollinger, von Schulte, and Reinkens, before their excommunication as "Old Catholics," because it lacked the two fundamental conditions of liberty of discussion and moral unanimity of suffrage. But the subsequent submission of all the Bishops who had voted against Papal Infallibility, supplies the defect as far as the Roman Church is concerned. There was nothing left to them but either to submit or to be expelled. They chose the former, and thus destroyed the legal and moral force of their protest, although not the power of truth and the nature of the facts on which it was based. Henceforward Romanism must stand or fall with the Vatican Council. But (as we have before intimated) Romanism is not to be confounded with Catholicism any more than the Jewish hierarchy which crucified our Saviour, is identical with the people of Israel, from which sprang the Apostles and early converts of Christianity. The destruction of the infallible and irreformable Papacy may be the emancipation of Catholicism, and lead it from its prison-house to the light of a new Reformation.

THE VATICAN DECREES. THE CONSTITUTION ON THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

Three schemes on matters of faith were prepared for the Vatican Council—one against Rationalism, one on the Church of Christ, and one on Christian Matrimony. The first two were revised and adopted; the third was indefinitely postponed. There was also much discussion on the preparation of a small popular Catechism adapted to the present doctrinal status of the Roman Church, and intended to supersede the numerous popular Catechisms now in use; but the draft, which assigned the whole teaching power of the Church to the Pope, to the exclusion of the Episcopate, encountered such opposition (57 *Non Placet*, 24 conditional *Placet*) in the

provisional vote of May 4, that it was laid on the table and never called up again.

I. THE DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CATHOLIC FAITH (CONSTITUTIO DOGMATICA DE FIDE CATHOLICA.)

It was unanimously adopted in the third public session, April 24 (*Dominica in albis*), 1870.

The original draft laid before the Council embraced eighteen chapters—on Pantheism, Rationalism, Scripture and tradition, revelation, faith and reason, the Trinity, the two natures of Christ, the primitive state, original sin, the Christian redemption, the supernatural order of grace, but was laid aside! Archbishop Connelly, of Halifax, recommended that it should be decently buried.

In its present form, the Constitution on the Catholic faith is reduced to four chapters, with a proemium and a conclusion. Chap. I. treats of God as the Creator; Chap. II. of revelation; Chap. III. of faith; Chap. IV. of faith and reason. Then follow 18 canons, in which the errors of Pantheism, Naturalism, and Rationalism are condemned in a manner substantially the same, though more clearly and fully, than had been done in the first two sections of the Syllabus.

The decree asserts, in the old scholastic terminology, the well-known principles of Supernaturalism as held by orthodox Christians in all ages, but it completely ignores the freedom and progress of theological and philosophical science and learning since the Council of Trent, and it forbids (in Chap. II.) all interpretation of the Scriptures which does not agree with the Romish traditions, the Latin Vulgate, and the fictitious "unanimous consent of the Fathers." Hence a liberal member of the Council, in the course of discussion, declared the *schema de fide* a work of supererogation. "What boots it," he said, "to condemn errors which have been long condemned, and tempt no Catholic? The false beliefs of mankind are beyond the reach of your decrees. The best defence of Catholicism is religious science. Encourage sound learning, and prove by deeds as well as words that it is the mission of the Church to promote among the nations liberty, light, and true prosperity." On the other hand, the *Univers* calls the schema a "masterpiece of clearness and force;" the *Civiltà cattolica* sees in it "a reflex of the wisdom of God;" and Archbishop Manning thinks that its importance "can not be over-estimated," that it is "the broadest and the boldest affirmation of the supernatural and spiritual order ever yet made in the face of the world, which is now more than ever sunk in sense and heavy with Materialism." Whatever be the value of the positive principles of the schema, its Popish head and tail reduce it to a *brutum fulmen* outside of the Romish Church, and even the most orthodox Protestants must apply to it the warning, *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*.

The preamble, even in its present modified form, derives modern Rationalism and infidelity, as a legitimate fruit, from the heresies condemned by the Council of Trent—that is, from the Protestant Reformation; in the face of the fact, patent to every scholar, that Protestant theology has been in the thickest of the fight with unbelief, and, notwithstanding all its excesses, has produced a far richer exegetical and apologetic literature than Romanism during the last three hundred years. The boldest testimony heard in the Council was directed against this preamble by Bishop Strossmayer, from the Turkish frontier (March 22, 1870). He characterized the charge against Protestantism as neither just nor charitable. Protestants, he said, abhorred the errors condemned in the schema as much as Catholics. The germ of Rationalism existed in the Catholic Church before the Reformation, especially

in the
dign
time
refut
and
and
the
Alth
that
Th
cons
spec
This
The
only
diti
char
snar
fath
virtu
Bish
pect
T
II
STIT
It
18,
Prin
in t
Rom
T
Pap
the
ordi
dict
in r
men
and
Chr
teac
whe
the
that
ther
T
hist
T
begi
of th
of a
Cou
ster
the
of E

in the humanism which was nourished in the very sanctuary by the highest dignitaries, and bore its worst fruits in the midst of a Catholic nation at the time of Voltaire and the Encyclopedists. Catholics had produced no better refutation of the errors enumerated in the schema than such men as Leibnitz and Guizot. There were multitudes of Protestants in Germany, England, and North America who loved our Lord Jesus Christ, and had inherited from the shipwreck of faith positive truths and monuments of divine grace. Although this speech was greeted with execrations, it had at least the effect that the objectionable preamble was somewhat modified.

The supplement of the decree binds all Catholics to observe also those constitutions and decrees by which such erroneous opinions as are not here specifically enumerated have been proscribed and condemned by the Holy See. This can be so construed as to include all the eighty errors of the Syllabus. The minority who in the General Congregation had voted *Non Placet* or only a conditional *Placet*, were quieted by the official assurance that the addition involved no new dogma, and had a disciplinary rather than a didactic character. "Some gave their votes with a heavy heart, conscious of the snare." Strossmayer stayed away. Thus a unanimous vote of 667 or 668 fathers was secured in the public session, and the Infallibility decree was virtually anticipated. The Pope, after proclaiming the dogma, gave the Bishops his benediction of peace, and gently intimated what he next expected from them.

THE VATICAN DECREES, CONTINUED. THE INFALLIBILITY DECREE.

II. THE FIRST DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST (CONSTITUTIO DOGMATICA PRIMA DE ECCLESIA CHRISTI).

It was passed, with two dissenting votes, in the fourth public session, July 18, 1870. It treats, in four chapters—(1) on the institution of the Apostolic Primacy in the blessed Peter; (2) on the perpetuity of St. Peter's Primacy in the Roman Pontiff; (3) on the power and nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff; (4) on the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

The new features are contained in the last two chapters, which teach *Papal Absolutism* and *Papal Infallibility*. The third chapter vindicates to the Roman Pontiff a superiority of *ordinary* episcopal (not simply an extraordinary primatial) power over all other Churches, and an *immediate* jurisdiction, to which all Catholics, both pastors and people, are bound to submit in matters not only of faith and morals, but even of discipline and government. He is, therefore, the Bishop of Bishops, over every single Bishop, and over all Bishops put together; he is in the fullest sense the Vicar of Christ, and all Bishops are simply Vicars of the Pope. The fourth chapter teaches and defines, as a divinely revealed dogma, that the Roman Pontiff, when speaking from his chair (*ex cathedra*), i. e., in his official capacity, to the Christian world on subjects relating to faith or morals, is infallible, and that such definitions are irreformable (i. e., final and irreversible) in and of themselves, and not in consequence of the consent of the Church.

To appreciate the value and bearing of this decree, we must give a brief history of it.

The Infallibility question was suspended over the Council from the very beginning as the question of questions, for good or for evil. The original plan of the Infallibilists, to decide it by acclamation, had to be abandoned in view of a formidable opposition, which was developed inside and outside of the Council. The majority of the Bishops circulated, early in January, a monster petition, signed by 410 names, in favor of Infallibility. The Italians and the Spaniards circulated similar petitions separately. Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore, formerly an anti-Infallibilist, prepared an address offering some

compromise to the effect that an appeal from the Pope to an œcumenical Council should be reposed. But five counter-petitions, signed by very weighty names, in all 187, representing various degrees of opposition, but agreed as to the *inopportunit*y of the definition, were sent in during the same month (Jan. 12 to 18) by German and Austrian, Hungarian, French, American, Oriental, and Italian Bishops.

The Pope received none of these addresses, but referred them to the Deputation on Faith. While in this he showed his impartiality, he did not conceal, in a private way, his real opinion, and gave it the weight of his personal character and influence. "Faith in his personal infallibility," says a well-informed Catholic, "and belief in a constant and special communication with the Holy Ghost, form the basis of the character of Pius IX." In the Council itself, Archbishop Manning, the Anglican convert, was the most zealous, devout, and enthusiastic Infallibilist; he urged the definition as the surest means of gaining hesitating Anglo-Catholics and Ritualists longing for *absolute* authority; while his former teacher and friend, Dr. Pusey, feared that the new dogma would make the breach between Oxford and Rome wider than ever. Manning is "more Catholic than Catholics" to the manner born, as the English settlers in Ireland were more Irish than Irishmen, and is altogether worthy to be the successor of Pius IX. in the chair of St. Peter. Both these eminent and remarkable persons show how a sincere faith in a dogma, which borders on blasphemy, may, by a strange delusion or hallucination, be combined with rare purity and amiability of character.

Besides the all-powerful aid of the Pope, whom no Bishop can disobey without fatal consequences, the Infallibilists had the great advantage of perfect unity of sentiment and aim; while the anti-Infallibilists were divided among themselves, many of them being simply *inopportunists*. They professed to agree with the majority in principle or practice, and to differ from them only on the subordinate question of definability and opportunity. This qualified opposition had no weight whatever with the Pope, who was as fully convinced of the opportunity and necessity of the definition as he was of the dogma itself. And even the most advanced anti-Infallibilists, as Kenrick, Hefele, and Strossmayer, were too much hampered by Romish traditionalism to plant their foot firmly on the Scriptures, which after all must decide all questions of faith.

In the meantime a literary war on Infallibility was carried on in the Catholic Church in Germany, France, and England, and added to the commotion in Rome. A large number of pamphlets, written or inspired by prominent members of the Council, appeared for and against Infallibility. Distinguished outsiders, as Dollinger, Gratry, Hyacinthe, Montalembert, and Newman, mixed in the fight, and strengthened the minority. The utterance of Dr. John Henry Newman, the intellectual leader of the Anglo-Catholic apostasy, and by far the ablest scholar and dialectician among English Romanists, reveals a most curious state of mind, oscillating between absolute infallibilism and hopeless skepticism, and taking refuge at last in prayer—not to Christ, nor to the Holy Ghost, nor to the Apostles, but—to St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, that they might enlighten the Council at this critical juncture, and decide the matter by their intercession.

After preliminary skirmishes, the formal discussion began in earnest in the 50th session of the General Congregation, May 18, 1870, and lasted to the 86th General Congregation, July 16. About eighty Latin speeches were delivered in the general discussion on the schema *de Romano Pontifice*, nearly one-half of them on the part of the opposition, which embraced less than one-fifth of the Council. When the arguments and the patience of the assembly were pretty well exhausted, the President, at the petition of a hundred and

fifty Bishops, closed the general discussion on the third day of June. About forty more Bishops, who had entered their names, were thus prevented from speaking; but one of them, Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, published his strong argument against Infallibility in Naples. Then five special discussions commenced on the proemium and the four chapters. "For the fifth or last discussion a hundred and twenty Bishops inscribed their names to speak; fifty of them were heard, until on both sides the burden became too heavy to bear; and, by mutual consent, a useless and endless discussion, from mere exhaustion, ceased."

When the vote was taken on the whole four chapters of the Constitution of the Church, July 13, 1870, in the 85th secret session of the General Congregation (601 members being present), 451 voted *Placet*, 88 *Non Placet*, 62 *Placet juxta modum*, over 80 (perhaps 91), though present in Rome or in the neighborhood, abstained for various reasons from voting. Among the negative votes were the Prelates most distinguished for learning and position, as SCHWARZENBERG, Cardinal Prince-Archbishop of Prague; RAUSCHER, Cardinal Prince-Archbishop of Vienna; DARBOY, Archbishop of Paris; MATTHIEU, Cardinal-Archbishop of Besançon; GINOULHIAC, Archbishop of Lyons; DUPANLOUP, Bishop of Orleans; MARET, Bishop of Sura (i. p.); SIMOR, Archbishop of Gran and Primate of Hungary; HAYNALD, Archbishop of Kalocsa; FÖRSTER, Prince-Archbishop of Breslau; SCHERR, Archbishop of Munich; KETTELER, Bishop of Mayence; HEFELE, Bishop of Rottenburg; STROSSMAYER, Bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium; MACHALE, Archbishop of Tuam; CONNOLLY, Archbishop of Halifax; KENRICK, Archbishop of St. Louis.

On the evening of the 13th of July the minority sent a deputation, consisting of Simor, Ginoulhiac, Scherr, Darboy, Ketteler, and Rivet, to the Pope. After waiting an hour, they were admitted at nine o'clock in the evening. They asked simply for a withdrawal of the addition to the third chapter, which assigns to the Pope the exclusive possession of all ecclesiastical powers, and for the insertion, in the fourth chapter, of a clause limiting his infallibility to those decisions which he pronounces "*innixius testimonio ecclesiarum*." Pius returned the almost incredible answer: "I shall do what I can, my dear sons, but I have not yet read the scheme: I do not know what it contains." He requested Darboy, the spokesman of the deputation, to hand him the petition in writing. Darboy promised to do so; and added, not without irony, that he would send with it the schema which the Deputation on Faith and the Legates had with such culpable levity omitted to lay before his Holiness, exposing him to the risk of proclaiming in a few days a decree he was ignorant of. Pius surprised the deputation by the astounding assurance that the whole Church had always taught the unconditional infallibility of the Pope. Then Bishop Ketteler of Mayence implored the holy Father on his knees to make some concession for the peace and unity of the Church. This prostration of the proudest of the German prelates made some impression. Pius dismissed the deputation in a hopeful temper. But immediately afterwards Manning and Senestrey (Bishop of Regensburg) strengthened his faith, and frightened him by the warning that, if he made any concession, he would be disgraced in history as a second Honorius.

In the secret session on the 16th of July, on motion of some Spanish Bishops, an addition was inserted "*non autem ex consensu ecclesiarum*," which makes the decree still more obnoxious. On the same day Cardinal Rauscher, in a private audience, made another attempt to induce the Pope to yield, but was told, "It is too late."

On the 17th of July fifty-six Bishops sent a written protest to the Pope,

declaring that nothing had occurred to change their conviction as expressed in their negative vote; on the contrary, they were confirmed in it; yet, filial piety and reverence for the holy Father would not permit them to vote *Non Placet*, openly and in his face, in a matter which so intimately concerned his person, and that therefore they had resolved to return forthwith to their flocks, which had already too long been deprived of their presence, and were now filled with apprehensions of war. Schwarzenberg, Matthieu, Simor, and Darboy head the list of signers. On the evening of the same day not only the fifty-six signers, but sixty additional members of the opposition departed from Rome, promising to each other to make their future conduct dependent on mutual understanding.

This was the turning point: the opposition broke down by its own act of cowardice. They ought to have stood like men on the post of duty, and repeated their negative vote according to their honest convictions. They could thus have prevented the passage of this momentous decree, or at all events shorn it of its œcumenical weight, and kept it open for future revision and possible reversal. But they left Rome at the very moment when their presence was most needed, and threw an easy victory into the lap of the majority.

When, therefore, the fourth public session was held, on the memorable 18th of July (Monday), there were but 535 Fathers present, and of these all voted *Placet*, with the exception of two, viz., Bishop Riccio, of Cajazzo, in Sicily, and Bishop Fitzgerald, of Little Rock, Arkansas, who had the courage to vote *Non Placet*, but immediately, before the close of the session, submitted to the voice of the Council. In this way a moral unanimity was secured as great as in the first Council of Nicæa, where likewise two refused to subscribe the Nicene Creed. "What a wise direction of Providence," exclaimed the *Civiltà cattolica*, "585 years against 2 nays, therefore almost total unanimity; and yet two nays, therefore full liberty of the Council. How vain are all attacks against the œcumenical character of this most beautiful of all Councils!"

After the vote the Pope confirmed the decrees and canons on the Constitution of the Church of Christ, and added from his own inspiration the assurance that the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff did not suppress but aid, not destroy but build up, and formed the best protection of the rights and interests of the Episcopate.

The days of the two most important public sessions of the Vatican Council, namely the first and the last, were the darkest and stormiest which Rome saw from Dec. 8, 1869, to the 18th of July, 1870. The Episcopal votes and the Papal proclamation of the new dogma were accompanied by flashes of lightning and claps of thunder from the skies, and so great was the darkness which spread over the Church of St. Peter, that the Pope could not read the decree of his own Infallibility without the artificial light of a candle. This voice of nature was variously interpreted, either as a condemnation of Gallicanism and liberal Catholicism, or as a divine attestation of the dogma like that which accompanied the promulgation of the law from Mount Sinai, or as an evil omen of impending calamities to the Papacy.

And behold, the day after the proclamation of the dogma, Napoleon III., the political ally and supporter of Pius IX., unchained the furies of war, which in a few weeks swept away the Empire of France and the temporal throne of the infallible Pope. His own subjects forsook him, and almost unanimously voted for a new sovereign, whom he had ex-communicated as the worst enemy of the Church. A German Empire arose from victorious battle-fields, and Protestantism sprang to the political and military leadership of Europe. About half a dozen Protestant Churches have since been

organized in Rome, where none was tolerated before, except outside of the walls or in the house of some foreign ambassador; a branch of the Bible Society was established, which the Pope in his Syllabus denounces as a pest; and a public debate was held in which even the presence of Peter at Rome was called in question. History records no more striking example of swift retribution of criminal ambition. Once before the Papacy was shaken to its base at the very moment when it felt itself most secure: Leo X. had hardly concluded the fifth and last Lateran Council in March, 1517, with a celebration of victory, when an humble monk in the North of Europe sounded the key-note of the great Reformation.

What did the Bishops of the minority do? They all submitted, even those who had been most vigorous in opposing, not only the opportunity of the definition, but the dogma itself. Some hesitated long, but yielded at last to the heavy pressure. Cardinal Rauscher, of Vienna, published the decrees already in August, and afterwards withdrew his powerful "Observations on the Infallibility of the Church" from the market; regarding this as an act of glorious self-denial for the welfare of the Church. Cardinal Schwarzenberg, of Prague, waited with the publication till Jan. 11, 1871, and shifted the responsibility upon his theological advisers. Bishop Hefele, of Bottenburg, who has forgotten more about the history of Councils than the infallible Pope ever knew, after delaying till April 10, 1871, submitted, not because he had changed his conviction, but, as he says, because "the peace and unity of the Church is so great a good that great and heavy personal sacrifices may be made for it;" i.e., truth must be sacrificed to peace. Bishop Maret, who wrote two learned volumes against Papal Infallibility and in defense of Gallicanism, declared in his retraction that he "wholly rejects everything in his work which is opposed to the dogma of the Council," and "withdraws it from sale." Archbishop Kenrick yielded, but has not refuted his *Concio habenda at non habita*, which remains an irrefragable argument against the new dogma. Even Strossmayer, the boldest of the bold in the minority, lost his courage, and keeps his peace. Darboy died a martyr to the revolt of the communists of Paris, in April, 1871. In a conversation with Dr. Michaud, Vicar of St. Madeleine, who since seceded from Rome, he counselled external and official submission, with a mental reservation, and in the hope of better times. His successor, Msgr. Guibert, published the decrees a year later (April 1872), without asking the permission of the head of the French Republic. Of those opponents who, though not members of the Council, carried as great weight as any Prelate, Montalembert died during the Council; Newman kept silence; Péro Gratry, who had declared and proved that the question of Honorius "is totally gangrened by fraud," wrote from his death-bed at Montreux, in Switzerland (Feb. 1872), to the new Archbishop of Paris, that he submitted to the Vatican Council, and effaced "everything to the contrary he may have written."

It is said that the adhesion of the minority Bishops was extorted by the threat of the Pope not to renew their "quinquennial faculties" (*facultates quinquennales*), that is, the Papal licenses renewed every five years, permitting them to exercise extraordinary episcopal functions which ordinarily belong to the Pope, as the power of absolving from heresy, schism, apostasy, secret crime (except murder), from vows, duties of fasting, the power of permitting the reading of prohibited books (for the purpose of refutation), marrying within prohibited degrees, etc.

But aside from this pressure, the following considerations sufficiently explain the fact of submission.

1. Many of the dissenting Bishops were professedly anti-Infallibilists, not from principle, but only from subordinate considerations of expediency,

because they apprehended that the definition would provoke the hostility of secular governments, and inflict great injury on Catholic interests, especially in Protestant countries. Events have since proved that their apprehension was well founded.

2. All Roman Bishops are under an oath of allegiance to the Pope, which binds them "to preserve, defend, *increase and advance* the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the Pope, and his successors."

3. The minority Bishops defended Episcopal infallibility against Papal infallibility. They claimed for themselves what they denied to the Pope. Admitting the infallibility of an œcumenical Council, and forfeiting by their voluntary absence on the day of voting the right of their protest, they must either on their own theory, accept the decision of the Council, or give up their theory, cease to be Roman Catholics, and run the risk of a new schism.

At the same time this submission is an instructive lesson of the fearful spiritual despotism of the Papacy, which overrules the stubborn facts of history and the sacred claims of individual conscience. For the facts so clearly and forcibly brought out before and during the Council by such men as Kenrick, Hefele, Rauscher, Maret, Schwarzenberg, and Dupanloup, have not changed, and can never be undone. On the one hand we find the results of a life-long, conscientious, and thorough study of the most learned divines of the Roman Church, on the other, ignorance, prejudice, perversion, and defiance of Scripture and tradition; on the one hand we have history shaping theology, on the other theology ignoring or changing history; on the one hand the just exercise of reason, on the other blind submission which destroys reason and conscience. But truth must and will prevail at last.



PAPAL INFALLIBILITY EXPLAINED, AND TESTED BY TRADITION AND SCRIPTURE.

Literature.

I. FOR INFALLIBILITY.

The older defenders of Infallibility are chiefly BELLARMIN, BALLERINI, LITTA, ALPHONS DE LIGUORI (whom the Pope raised to the dignity of a *doctor ecclesiae*, March 11, 1872), CARD. ORSI, PERRONE, and JOSEPH COUNT DE MAISTRE (Sardinian statesman, d. at Turin Feb. 26, 1821, author of *Du Pape*, 1819; new edition, Paris, 1843).

During and after the Vatican Council: the works of Archbishops MANNING and DECHAMPS, already quoted, pp. 184, 185.

JOS. CARDONI (Archbishop of Edessa, in partibus): *Elucubratio de dogmatica Romani Pontificis Infallibilitate ejusque Definibilitate*, Romae, (typis Civilitatis Catholicæ,) 1870 (May, 174 pp). The chief work on the Papal side, clothed with a semi-official character.

HERMAN RUMP: *Die Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes und die Stellung der in Deutschland verbreiteten theologischen Lehrbücher zu dieser Lehre*, Munster, 1870 (173 pp.)

FRANZ FRIEDHOFF (Prof. at Munster): *Gegen-Erwagungen über die papstliche Unfehlbarkeit*, Munster, 1869 (21 pp). Superficial.

FLOR. RIESS and KARL VON WEBER (Jesuits): *Das Oekum. Concil. Stimmen aus Maria-Laach, Neue Folge*, No. X. *Die papstliche Unfehlbarkeit und der alte Glaube der Kirche*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1870 (110 pp.).

G. BICKEL: *Gründe für die Unfehlbarkeit des Kirchenoberhauptes nebst Widerlegung der Einwurfe*, Munster, 1870.

Rev. P. WENINGER (Jesuit): *L'infallibilit  du Pape devant la raison et l'ecriture, les papes et les conciles, les p res et les thologiens, les rois et les empereurs*. Translated from the German into French by P. BELET. (Highly spoken of by Pius IX. in a brief to Abbe Belet, Nov. 17, 1869; see Friedberg, l. c. p. 487. Weninger wrote besides several pamphlets on Infallibility in German, Innsbruck, 1841; Graz, 1858; in English, New York and Cincinnati, 1868. Archbishop Kenrick, in his *Concio*, speaks of him as "a pious and extremely zealous but ignorant man," whom he honored with "the charity of silence" when requested to recommend one of his books.)

Widerlegung der vier unter di Vater des Concils vertheilten Brochuren gegen die Unfehlbarkeit (transl. of *Animadversiones in quatuor contra Romani Pontificis infallibilitatem editos libellos*), Munster, 1870.

Bishop JOS. FESSLER: *Die wahre und die falsche Unfehlbarkeit der Papste* (against Prof. von Schulte), Wien, 1871.

Bishop KETTEL R: *Das unfehlbare Lehrant des Papstes, nach der Entscheidung des Vaticanischen Concils*, Mainz, 1871, 3te Aufl.

M. J. SCHEEBEN: *Schulte und Dollinger, gegen das Concil, Kritische Beleuchtung*, etc., Regensburg, 1871.

Prof. AMEDEE DE MARGERIE: *Lettre au R. P. Gratry sur le Pape Honorius et le Breviatre Romain*, Nancy, 1870.

II. AGAINST INFALLIBILITY.

(a) By Members of the Council.

Mgr. H. L. C. MARET (Bishop of Sura, in part., Canon of St. Denis and Dean of the Theological Faculty in Paris): *Du Concile general et de la paix religieuse*, Paris, 1869, 2 Tom. (pp. 554 and 555.). An elaborate defense of Gallicanism; since revoked by the author, and withdrawn from sale.

PETER RICHARD KENRICK (Archbishop of St. Louis): *Concio in Concilio Vaticano habenda at non habita*, Neapoli (typis fractum de Angelis in via Pellegrini 4,) 1870. Reprinted in Friedrich, *Documenta* I, pp. 187-226. An English translation in L. W. Bacon's *An Inside View of the Vatican Council*, New York, pp. 90-166.

QUESTIO (no place or date of publication). A very able Latin dissertation occasioned and distributed (perhaps partly prepared) by Bishop KETTEL R, of

Mayence, during the Council. It was printed but not published in Switzerland, in 1870, and reprinted in Friedrich, *Documenta*, I. pp. 1-128.

La liberté du Concile et l'infaillibilité. Written or inspired by DABOY, Archbishop of Paris. Only fifty copies were printed, for distribution among the Cardinals. Reprinted in Friedrich, *Documenta*, I. pp. 129-186.

CARD. RAUSCHER: *Observationes quædam de infallibilitatis ecclesiæ subjecto*, Neapoli and Vindobonæ, 1870 (88 pp.).

De Summi Pontificis infallibilitate personali, Neapoli, 1870 (32 pp.). Written by Prof. SALESIUS MAYER, and distributed in the Council by Cardinal Schwarzenberg.

JOS. DE HEFELE (Bishop of Rottenburg, formerly Prof. at Tübingen): *Causa Honorii Papæ*, Neap. 1870 (pp. 28). The same: *Honorius und das sechste allgemeine Concil* (with an appendix against Pennachi, 43 pp.), Tübingen, 1870. English translation, with introduction, by Dr. HENRY B. SMITH, in the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princetown Review*, New York, for April, 1872, pp. 273 sqq. Against Hefeles comp. JOS. PENNACHI (Prof. of Church History in Rome): *De Honorii I. Pontificis Romani causa in Concilio VI.*

(b) By Catholics, not members of the Council.

JANUS: *The Pope and the Council*, 1869. See above, p. 134.

Erwägungen für die Bischöfe des Conciliums über die Frage der päpstlichen Unfehlbarkeit, Oct. 1869. Dritte Aufl. München. [By J. VON DOLLINGER.]

J. VON DOLLINGER: *Einige Worte über die Unfehlbarkeitsadresse*, etc., München, 1870.

JOS. H. REINKENS (Prof. of Church History in Breslau): *Ueber papstliche Unfehlbarkeit*, München, 1870.

CLEMENS SCHMITZ (Cath. Priest): *Ist der Papst unfehlbar? Aus Deutschlands und des P. Deharbe Catechismen beantwortet*, München, 1870.

J. FR. RITTER VON SCHULTE (Prof. in Prague, now in Bonn): *Das Unfehlbarkeits-Decret vom 18 Juli 1870 auf seine Verbindlichkeit geprüft*, Prag, 1870. *Die Macht der röm. Papste über Fürsten, Länder, Völker, etc. seit Gregor VII. zur Würdigung ihrer Unfehlbarkeit beleuchtet*, etc., 2nd edition, Prag, 1870. The same, translated into English (*The Power of the Roman Popes over Princes, etc.*), by Alfred Somers [a brother of Schulte], Adelaide, 1871.

A. GRATRY (Priest of the Oratoire and Member of the French Academy): *Four Letters to the Bishop of Orleans (Dupanloup) and the Archbishop of Malines (Dechamps)*, in French, Paris, 1870; several editions, also translated into German, English, etc. These learned and eloquent letters gave rise to violent controversies. They were denounced by several Bishops, and prohibited in their dioceses; approved by others, and by Montalembert. The Pope praised the opponents. Against him wrote Dechamps (Three Letters to Gratry, in French; German translation, Mayence, 1870) and A. de Margerie. Gratry recanted on his death-bed.

P. LE PAGE RENOIR: *The Case of Pope Honorius*, Lond. 1869.

ANTONIO MAGRASSI: *Lo Schema sull' infallibilità personale del Romano Pontefice*, Alessandria, 1870 (64 pp.).

Della pretesa infallibilità personale del Romano Pontefice, 2d. ed., Firenze, 1870 (Anonymous, 80 pp.).

J. A. B. LUTTERBECK: *Die Clementinen und ihr Verhältniss zum Unfehlbarkeitsdogma*, Giessen, 1872 (pp. 85).

The sinlessness of the Virgin Mary and the personal infallibility of the Pope are the characteristic dogmas of modern Romanism, the two test dogmas which must decide the ultimate fate of this system. Both were enacted under the same Pope, and both faithfully reflect his character. Both have the advantage of logical consistency from certain premises, and seem to be the very perfection of the Romish form of piety and the Romish principle of authority. Both rest on pious fiction and fraud; both present a refined idolatry by clothing a pure humble woman and a mortal sinful man with divine attributes. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which ex-

empties the Virgin Mary from sin and guilt, perverts Christianity into Marianism; the dogma of Infallibility, which exempts the Bishop of Rome from error, resolves Catholicism into Papalism, or the Church into the Pope. The worship of a woman is virtually substituted for the worship of Christ, and a man-god in Rome for the God-man in heaven. This is a severe judgment, but a closer examination will sustain it.

The dogma of the Immaculate Conception, being confined to the sphere of devotion, passed into the modern Roman creed without serious difficulty; but the dogma of Papal Infallibility, which involves a question of absolute power, forms an epoch in the history of Romanism, and created the greatest commotion and a new secession. It is in its very nature the most fundamental and most comprehensive of all dogmas. It contains the whole system in a nutshell. It constitutes a new rule of faith. It is the article of the standing or falling Church. It is the direct antipode of the Protestant principle of the absolute supremacy and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures. It establishes a perpetual divine oracle in the Vatican. Every Catholic may hereafter say, I believe—not because Christ, or the Bible, or the Church, but—because the infallible Pope has so declared and commanded. Admitting this dogma, we admit not only the whole body of doctrines contained in the Tridentine standards, but all the official Papal bulls, including the mediæval monstrosities of the Syllabus (1864), the condemnation of Jansenism, the bull "*Unam Sanctam*" of Boniface VIII. (1302), which, under pain of damnation, claims for the Pope the double sword, the secular as well as the spiritual, over the whole Christian world, and the power to depose princes and to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance. The past is irreversibly settled, and in all future controversies on faith and morals we must look to the same unerring tribunal in the Vatican. Even œcumenical Councils are superseded hereafter, and would be a mere waste of time and strength.

On the other hand, if the dogma is false, it involves a blasphemous assumption, and makes the nearest approach to the fulfilment of St. Paul's prophecy of the man of sin, who "as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself off that he is God" (2 Thess. ii. 4).

Let us first see what the dogma does not mean, and what it does mean.

It does not mean that the Pope is infallible in his *private* opinions on theology and religion. As a man, he may be a heretic (as Liberius, Honorius, and John XXII.), or even an unbeliever (as John XXIII., and, perhaps, Leo X.), and yet, at the same time, infallible as Pope, after the fashion of Balaam and Caiaphas.

Nor does it mean that infallibility extends beyond the proper sphere of religion and the Church. The Pope may be ignorant of science and literature, and make grave mistakes in his political administration, or be misinformed on matters of fact (unless necessarily involved in doctrinal decisions), and yet be infallible in defining articles of faith.

Infallibility does not imply impeccability. And yet freedom from error and freedom from sin are so nearly connected in men's minds that it seems utterly impossible that such moral monsters as Alexander VI. and those infamous Popes who disgraced humanity during the Roman pornography in the tenth and eleventh centuries, should have been vicars of Jesus Christ and infallible organs of the Holy Ghost. If the inherent infallibility of the visible Church logically necessitates the infallibility of the visible head, it is difficult to see why the same logic should not with equal conclusiveness derive the personal holiness of the head from the holiness of the body.

On the other hand, the dogma does mean that all official utterances of the Roman Pontiff addressed to the Catholic Church on matters of Christian faith and duty are infallibly true, and must be accepted with the same faith

as the word of the living God. They are not simply final in the sense in which all decisions of an absolute government or a supreme court of justice are final until abolished or superseded by other decisions, but they are irrefrangible, and can never be revoked. This infallibility extends over eighteen centuries, and is a special privilege conferred by Christ upon Peter, and through him upon all his legitimate successors. It belongs to every Pope from Clement to Pius IX., and to every Papal bull addressed to the Catholic world. It is personal, i. e., inherent in Peter and the Popes; it is independent, and needs no confirmation from the Church or an œcumenical Council, either preceding or succeeding; its decrees are binding, and can not be rejected without running the risk of eternal damnation.

Even within the narrow limits of the Vatican decision there is room for controversy on the precise meaning of the figurative term *ex cathedra loqui*, and the extent of faith and morals, viz., whether Infallibility includes only the supernatural order of revealed truth and duty, or also natural and political duties, and questions of mere history, such as Peter's residence in Rome, the number of œcumenical Councils, the teaching of Jansen and Quesnel, and other disputed facts closely connected with dogmas. But the main point is clear enough. The Ultramontane theory is established. Gallicanism is dead and buried.

Ultramontanism and Gallicanism.

The Vatican dogma is the natural completion of the Papal polity, as the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary is the completion of the Papal cultus.

If we compare the Papal or Ultramontane theory with the Episcopal or Gallican theory, it has the undeniable advantage of logical consistency. The two systems are related to each other like monarchy and aristocracy, or rather like absolute monarchy and limited monarchy. The one starts from the divine institution of the Primacy (Matt. xvi. 18), and teaches the infallibility of the head; the other starts from the divine institution of the Episcopate (Matt. xviii. 18), and teaches the infallibility of the body and the superiority of an œcumenical Council over the Pope. Conceding once the infallibility of the collective Episcopate, we must admit, as a consequence, the infallibility of the Primacy, which represents the Episcopate, and forms its visible and permanent centre. If the body of the teaching Church can never err, the head can not err; and, *vice versa*, if the head is liable to error, the body can not be free from error. The Gallican theory is an untenable *via media*. It secures only a periodic and intermittent infallibility, which reveals itself in an œcumenical Council, and then relapses into a quiescent state; but the Ultramontane theory teaches an unbroken, ever living, and ever active infallibility, which alone can fully answer the demands of an absolute authority.

To refute Papal Infallibility is to refute also Episcopal Infallibility; for the higher includes the lower. The Vatican Council is the best argument against the Infallibility of œcumenical Councils, for it sanctioned a fiction, in open and irreconcilable contradiction to older œcumenical Councils, which not only assumed the possibility of Papal fallibility, but actually condemned a Pope as a heretic. The fifth Lateran Council (1512) declared the decrees of the Council of Pisa (1409) null and void; the Council of Florence denied the validity of the Council of Basle, and this denied the validity of the former. The Council of Constance condemned and burned John Huss for teaching evangelical doctrines; and this fact forced upon Luther, at the disputation with Eck at Leipzig, the conviction that even œcumenical Councils may err. Rome itself has rejected certain canons of Constantinople

and Chalcedon, which put the Pope on a par with the Patriarch of Constantinople; and a strict construction of the Papal theory would rule out the old œumenical Councils, because they were not convened nor controlled by the Pope; while the Greek Church rejects all Councils which were purely Latin.

The Bible makes no provision and has no promise for an œumenical Council. The Church existed and flourished for more than three hundred years before such a Council was heard of. Large assemblies are often ruled by passion, intrigue, and worldly ambition (remember the complaints of Gregory of Nazianzum on the Synods of the Nicene age). Majorities are not necessarily decisive in matters of faith. Christ promised to be even with two or three who are gathered in his name (Matt. xviii. 20). Elijah and the seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Babel were right over against the great mass of the people of Israel. Athanasius *versus mundum* represented the truth, and the world *versus Athanasium* was in error during the ascendancy of Arianism. In the eighteenth century the Church, both Catholic and Protestant, was under the power of infidelity, and true Christianity had to take refuge in small communities. Augustine maintained that one Council may correct another, and attain to a more perfect knowledge of truth. The history of the Church is unintelligible without the theory of progressive development, which implies many obstructions and temporary diseases. All the attributes of the Church are subject to the law of gradual expansion and growth, and will not be finally complete till the second coming of our Lord.

The Infallibility of the Pope and Personal Responsibility.

The Christian Church, as a divine institution, can never fail and never lose the truth. Christ has pledged his Spirit and life-giving presence to his people to the end of time, and even to two or three of his humblest disciples assembled in his name; yet they are not on that account Infallible. He gave authority in matters of discipline to every local Church (Matt. xviii. 17); and yet no one claims Infallibility to every congregation. The Holy Spirit will always guide believers into the truth, and the unerring Word of God can never perish. But local churches, like individuals, may fall into error, and be utterly destroyed from the face of the earth. The true Church of Christ always makes progress, and will go on conquering and to conquer to the end of the world. But the particular churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Asia Minor, and North Africa, where once the Apostles and St. Augustine taught, have disappeared, or crumbled into ruin, or have been overrun by the false prophet.

The truth will ever be within the reach of the sincere inquirer wherever the gospel is preached and the sacraments are rightly administered. God has revealed himself plainly enough for all purposes of salvation; and yet not so plainly as to supersede the necessity of faith, and to resolve Christianity into a mathematical demonstration. He has given us a rational mind to think and to judge, and a free will to accept or to reject. Christian faith is no blind submission, but an intelligent assent. It implies anxiety to inquire as well as willingness to receive. We are expressly directed to "prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good," (1 Thess. v. 21); to try the spirits whether they are of God (1 John iv. 1), and to refuse obedience even to an angel from heaven if he preach a different gospel (Gal. i. 8). The Berean Jews are commended as being more noble than those of Thessalonica, because they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and yet searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so (Acts xvii. 11). It was from the Infallible Scriptures alone, and not from tradition, that Paul and Appollos reasoned, after the example of Christ, who appeals to Moses and the Pro-

photo, and speaks disparagingly of the traditions of the elders as "obscuring the Word of God" or destroying its true effect.

In opposition to all this the Vatican dogma requires a wholesale slaughter of the intellect and will, and destroys the sense of personal responsibility. The fundamental error of Rome is that she identifies the true ideal Church of Christ with the empirical Church, and the empirical Church with the Romish Church, and the Romish Church with the Papacy, and the Papacy with the Pope, and at last substitutes a mortal man for the living Christ, who is the only and ever present head of the Church, "which is his body, the fulness of him who filleth all in all." Christ needs no vicar, and the very idea of a vicar implies the absence of the Master.

Papal Infallibility Tested by Tradition.

The dogma of Papal infallibility is mainly supported by an inferential dogmatic argument derived from the Primacy of Peter, who, as the Vicar of Christ, must also share in his infallibility; or from the nature and aim of the Church, which is to teach men the way of salvation, and must therefore be endowed with an infallible and ever availing organ for that purpose, since God always provides the means together with an end. A full-blooded Infallibilist, whose piety consists in absolute submission and devotion to his lord the Pope, is perfectly satisfied with this reasoning, and cares little or nothing for the Bible and for history, except so far as they suit his purpose. If facts disagree with his dogmas, all the worse for the facts. All you have to do is to ignore or to deny them, or to force them, by unnatural interpretations, into reluctant obedience to the dogmas. But after all, even according to the Roman Catholic theory, Scripture and history or tradition are the two indispensable tests of the truth of a dogma. It has always been held that the Pope and the Bishops are not the creators and judges, but the trustees and witnesses of the apostolic deposit of faith, and that they can define and proclaim no dogma which is not well founded in primitive tradition, written or unwritten. According to the famous rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, a dogma must have three marks of catholicity: the catholicity of time (*semper*), of space (*ubique*), and of number (*ab omnibus*). The argument from tradition is absolutely essential to orthodoxy in the Roman sense, and, as hitherto held, more essential than Scripture proof. The difference between Romanism and Protestantism on this point is this: Romanism requires proof from tradition first, from Scripture next, and makes the former indispensable, the latter simply desirable; while Protestantism reverses the order, and with its theory of the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice, and as an inexhaustible mine of truth that yields precious ore to every successive generation of miners, it may even dispense with traditional testimony altogether, provided that a doctrine can be clearly derived from the Word of God.

Now it can be conclusively proved that the dogma of Papal Infallibility, like the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, lacks every one of the three marks of catholicity. It is a comparative modern innovation. It was not dreamed of for more than a thousand years, and is unknown to this day in the Greek Church, the oldest in the world, and in matters of antiquity always an important witness. The whole history of Christianity would have taken a different course, if in all theological controversies an infallible tribunal in Rome could have been evoked. Ancient Creeds, Councils, Fathers, and Popes can be summoned as witnesses against the Vatican dogma.

1. The four *Œcumenical Creeds*, the most authoritative expressions of the

old Catholic faith of the Eastern and Western Churches, contain an article on the "holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," but not one word about the Bishops of Rome, or any other local Church. How easy and natural, yea, in view of the fundamental importance of the infallibility dogma, how necessary would have been the insertion of *Roman* after the other predicates of the Church, or the addition of the article: "The Pope of Rome, the successor of Peter and infallible vicar of Christ." If it had been believed then as now, it would certainly appear at least in the Roman form of the Apostles' Creed; but this is as silent on this point as the Aquilejan, the African, the Gallican, and other forms.

And this uniform silence of all the œcumenical Creeds is strengthened by the numerous local Creeds of the Nicene age, and by the various ante-Nicene rules of faith up to Tertullian and Irenæus, not one of which contains an allusion to such an article of faith.

2. The *œcumenical Councils* of the first eight centuries, which are recognized by the Greek and Latin Churches alike, are equally silent about, and positively inconsistent with, Papal Infallibility. They were called by Greek Emperors, not by Popes; they were predominantly, and some of them exclusively, Oriental; they issued their decrees in their own name, and in the fulness of authority, without thinking of submitting them to the approval of Rome; they even claimed the right of judging and condemning the Roman Pontiff, as well as any other Bishop or Patriarch.

In the first Nicene Council there was but one representative of the Latin Church (Hosius of Spain); and in the second and the fifth œcumenical Councils there was none at all. The second œcumenical Council (381), in the third canon, put the Patriarch of Constantinople on a par with the Bishop of Rome, assigning to the latter only a primacy of honor; and the fourth œcumenical Council (451) confirmed this canon in spite of the energetic protest of Pope Leo I.

But more than this: the sixth œcumenical Council, held 680, pronounced the anathema on Honorius, "the former Pope of old Rome," for teaching officially the Monothelite heresy; and this anathema was signed by all the members of the Council, including the three delegates of the Pope, and was several times repeated by the seventh and eighth Councils, which were presided over by Papal delegates. But we must return to this famous case again in another connection.

3. The *Fathers*, even those who unconsciously did most service to Rome, and laid the foundation for its colossal pretensions, yet had no idea of ascribing absolute supremacy and infallibility to the Pope.

Clement of Rome, the first Roman Bishop of whom we have any authentic account, wrote a letter to the Church at Corinth—not in his name, but in the name of the Roman Congregation; not with an air of superior authority, but as a brother to brethren—barely mentioning Peter, but eulogizing Paul, and with a clear consciousness of the great difference between an Apostle and a Bishop or Elder.

Ignatius of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom in Rome under Trajan, highly as he extols Episcopacy and Church unity in his seven Epistles, one of which is addressed to the Roman Christians, makes no distinction of rank among Bishops, but treats them as equals.

Irenæus of Lyons, the champion of the Catholic faith against the Gnostic heresy at the close of the second century, and the author of the famous and variously understood passage about the *potentior principallibus ecclesie Romanæ*, sharply reproved Victor of Rome when he ventured to excommunicate the Asiatic Christians for their different mode of celebrating Easter, and told him that it was contrary to Apostolic doctrine and practice to judge brethren

on account of eating and drinking, feasts and new moons. Cyprian, likewise a saint and a martyr, in the middle of the third century, in his zeal for visible and tangible unity against the schismatics of his diocese, first brought out the fertile doctrine of the Roman See as the chair of Peter and the centre of Catholic unity; yet with all his Romanizing tendency he was the great champion of the Episcopal solidarity and equality system, and always addressed the Roman Bishop as his "brother" and "colleague;" he even stoutly opposed Pope Stephen's view of the validity of heretical baptism, charging him with error, obstinacy, and presumption. He never yielded, and the African Bishops, at the third Council at Carthage (256), emphatically indorsed his opposition. Firmilian, Bishop of Cesarea, and Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, likewise bitterly condemned the doctrine and conduct of Stephen, and told him that in ex-communicating others he only excommunicated himself.

Augustine is often quoted by Infallibilists on account of his famous dictum, *Roma locuta est, causa finita est*. But he simply means that, since the Councils of Mileve and Carthage had spoken, and Pope Innocent I. had acceded to their decision, the Pelagian controversy was finally settled (although it was, after all, not settled till after his death, at the Council of Ephesus). Had he dreamed of the abuse made of the utterance, he would have spoken very differently. For the same Augustine apologized for Cyprian's opposition to Pope Stephen on the ground that the controversy had then not yet been decided by a Council, and maintained the view of the liability of Councils to correction and improvement by subsequent Councils. He moreover himself opposed Pope Zosimus, when, deceived by Pelagius, he declared him sound in the faith, although Pope Innocent I. had previously ex-communicated him as a dangerous heretic. And so determined were the Africans, under the lead of Augustine (417 and 418), that Zosimus finally saw proper to yield and to condemn Pelagianism in his "*Epistola Tractoria*."

Gregory I., or the Great, the last of the Latin Fathers, and the first of the mediæval Popes (590-604), stoutly protested against the assumption of the title *æumenical* or *universal* Bishop on the part of the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, and denounced this whole title and claim as *blasphemous*, *anti-Christian*, and *devilish*, since Christ alone was the Head and Bishop of the Church universal, while Peter, Paul, Andrew, and John were members under the same Head, and heads only of single portions of the whole. Gregory would rather call himself "the servant of the servants of God," which in the mouths of his successors, pretending to be Bishops of bishops and Lords of lords, has become a shameless irony.

As to the Greek Fathers, it would be useless to quote them, for the entire Greek Church in her genuine testimonies has never accepted the doctrine of Papal supremacy, much less of Papal Infallibility.

4. *Heretical Popes*.—We may readily admit the rock-like stability of the Roman Church in the early controversies on the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, as compared with the motion and changeability of the Greek churches during the same period, when the East was the chief theatre of dogmatic controversy and progress. Without some foundation in history, the Vatican dogma could not well have arisen. It would be impossible to raise the claim of infallibility in behalf of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, or Antioch, or Alexandria, or Constantinople, among whom were noted Arians, Nestorians, Monophysites, Monothelites, and other heretics. Yet there are not a few exceptions to the rule; and as many Popes, in their lives, flatly contradicted their title of holiness, so many departed, in their views, from Catholic truth. That the Popes after the Reformation condemned and cursed Protestant

truths well founded in Scriptures, we leave here out of sight, and confine our reasoning to facts within the limits of Roman Catholic orthodoxy.

The canon law assumes throughout that a Pope may openly teach heresy, or contumaciously contradict the Catholic doctrine; for it declares that, while he stands above all secular tribunals, yet he can be judged and deposed for the crime of heresy. This assumption was so interwoven in the faith of the Middle Ages that even the most powerful of all Popes, Innocent III. (d. 1216), gave expression to it when he said that, though he was only responsible to God, he may sin against the faith, and thus become subject to the judgment of the Church. Innocent IV. (d. 1254) speaks of heretical commands of the Pope, which need not be obeyed. When Boniface VIII. (d. 1303) declared that every creature must obey the Pope at the loss of eternal salvation, he was charged with having a devil, because he presumed to be infallible, which was impossible without witchcraft. Even Hadrian VI., in the sixteenth century, expressed the view, which he did not recant as Pope, that "if by the Roman Church is understood its head, the Pope, it is certain that he can err even in matters of faith."

This old Catholic theory of the fallibility of the Pope is abundantly borne out by actual facts, which have been established again and again by Catholic scholars of the highest authority for learning and candor. We need no better proofs than those furnished by them.

Zephyrinus (201-219) and Callistus (219-228) held and taught (according to the "*Philosophumena*" of Hippolytus, a martyr and a saint) the Patripassian heresy, that God the Father became incarnate and suffered with the Son.

Pope Liberius, in 358, subscribed an Arian creed for the purpose of regaining his episcopate, and condemned Athanasius, "the father of orthodoxy," who mentions the fact with indignation.

During the same period, his rival, Felix II., was a decided Arian; but there is a dispute about his legitimacy; some regarding him as an anti-Pope, although he has a place in the Romish Calendar of Saints, and Gregory XIII. (1582) confirmed his claim to sanctity, against which Baronius protested.

In the Pelagian controversy Pope Zosimus at first indorsed the orthodoxy of Pelagius and Celestius, whom his predecessor, Innocent I., had condemned; but he yielded afterwards to the firm protest of St. Augustine and the African Bishops.

In the Three-Chapter controversy, Pope Vigilius (588-555) showed a contemptible vacillation between two opinions: first indorsing; then, a year afterwards, condemning (in obedience to the Emperor's wishes) the Three Chapters (i. e., the writings of Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas); then refusing the condemnation; then tired of exile, submitting to the fifth oecumenical Council (553), which had broken off communion with him; and confessing that he had unfortunately been the tool of Satan, who labours for the destruction of the Church. A long schism in the West was the consequence. Pope Pelagius II. (585) significantly excused this weakness by the inconsistency of St. Peter at Antioch.

John XXII. (d. 1334) maintained, in opposition to Nicholas III. and Clement V. (d. 1314), that the Apostles did not live in perfect poverty, and branded the opposite doctrine of his predecessors as heretical and dangerous. He also held an opinion concerning the middle state of the righteous, which was condemned as heresy by the University of Paris.

Contradictory opinions were taught by different Popes on the sacraments, on the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, on matrimony, and on the subjection of the temporal power to the Church.

But the most notorious case of an undeniably official indorsement of heresy by a Pope is that of Honorius I. (625-638), which alone is sufficient to disprove Papal Infallibility, according to the maxim : *Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*. This case has been sifted to the very bottom before and during the Council, especially by Bishop Hefele and Père Gratry. The following decisive facts are established by the best documentary evidence :

(1.) Honorius taught *ex cathedra* (in two letters to his heretical colleague, Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople), the Monothelite heresy, which was condemned by the sixth œcumenical Council, i.e., the doctrine that Christ had only one will, and not two (corresponding to his two natures).

(2.) An œcumenical Council, universally acknowledged in the East and in the West, held in Constantinople, 78, condemned and excommunicated Honorius, "the former Pope of Old Rome," as a heretic, who with the help of the old serpent had scattered deadly error. The seventh œcumenical Council (787) and the eighth (869) repeated the anathema of the sixth.

(3.) The succeeding Popes down to the eleventh century, in a solemn oath at their accession, indorsed the sixth œcumenical Council, and pronounced "an eternal anathema" on the authors of the Monothelite heresy, together with Pope Honorius, because he had given aid and comfort to the perverse doctrines of the heretics. The Popes themselves, therefore, for more than three centuries, publicly recognized, first, that an œcumenical Council may condemn a Pope for open heresy, and, secondly, that Pope Honorius was justly condemned for heresy. Pope Leo II., in a letter to the Emperor, strongly confirmed the decree of the Council, and denounced his predecessor Honorius as one who "endeavored by profane treason to overthrow the immaculate faith of the Roman Church." The same Pope says, in a letter to the Spanish Bishops : "With eternal damnation have been punished Theodore, Cyrus, Sergius—together with Honorius—who did not extinguish at the very beginning the flame of heretical doctrine, as was becoming to his apostolic authority, but nursed it by his carelessness."

This case of Honorius is as clear and strong as any fact in Church history. Infallibilists have been driven to desperate efforts. Some pronounce the acts of the Council, which exist in Greek and Latin, downright forgeries (Baronius); others, admitting the acts, declare the letters of Honorius forgeries, so that he was unjustly condemned by the Council (Bellarmine)—both without a shadow of proof; still others, being forced at last to acknowledge the genuineness of the letters and acts, distort the former into an orthodox sense by a non-natural exegesis, and thus unwillingly fasten upon œcumenical Councils and Popes the charge of either dogmatic ignorance and stupidity, or malignant representation. Yet in every case the decisive fact remains that both Councils and Popes for several hundred years believed in the fallibility of the Pope, in flat contradiction to the Vatican Council. Such acts of violence upon history remind one of King James's short method with Dissenters : "Only hang them, that's all."

5. The idea of Papal absolutism and Infallibility, like that of the sinlessness of Mary, can be traced to apocryphal origin. It is found first, in the second century, in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, which contain a singular system of speculative Ebionism, and represent James of Jerusalem, the brother of the Lord, as the Bishop of Bishops, the centre of Christendom, and the general Vicar of Christ; he is the last arbiter, from whom there is no appeal; to him even Peter must give an account of his labors, and to him the sermons of Peter were sent for safe keeping.

In the Catholic Church the same idea, but transferred to the Bishop of Rome, is first clearly expressed in the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, that huge forgery of Papal letters, which appeared in the middle of the ninth century,

and had for its object the completion of the independence of the Episcopal hierarchy from the State, and the absolute power of the Popes, as the legislators and judges of all Christendom. Here the most extravagant claims are put into the mouths of the early Popes, from Clement (91) to Damasus (384), in the barbarous French Latin of the Middle Ages, and with such numerous and glaring anachronisms as to force the conviction of fraud even upon Roman Catholic scholars. One of these sayings is: "The Roman Church remains to the end free from the stain of heresy." Soon afterwards arose, in the same hierarchical interest, the legend of the donation of Constantine and his baptism by Pope Silvester, interpolations of the writings of the Fathers, especially Cyprian and Augustine, and a variety of fictions embodied in the *Gesta Liberii* and the *Liber Pontificalis*, and sanctioned by Gratianus (about 1150) in his *Decretum*, or collection of canons, which (as the first part of the *Corpus juris canonici*) became the code of laws for the whole Western Church, and exerted an extraordinary influence. By this series of pious frauds the mediæval Papacy, which was the growth of ages, was represented to the faith of the Church as a primitive institution of Christ, clothed with absolute and perpetual authority.

The Popes since Nicholas I. (858-867), who exceeded all his predecessors in the boldness of his designs, freely used what the spirit of a hierarchical, superstitious, and uncritical age furnished them. They quoted the fictitious letters of their predecessors as genuine, the Sardican canon on appeals as a canon of Niceæ, and the interpolated sixth canon of Niceæ, "the Roman Church always had the primacy," of which there is not a syllable in the original; and nobody doubted them. Papal absolutism was in full vigor from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII. Scholastic divines, even Thomas Aquinas, deceived by these literary forgeries, began to defend Papal absolutism over the whole Church, and the Councils of Lyons (1274) and of Florence (1439) sanctioned it, although the Greeks soon afterwards rejected the false union based upon such assumption.

But absolute power, especially of a spiritual kind, is invariably intoxicating and demoralizing to any mortal man who possesses it. God Almighty alone can bear it, and even he allows freedom to his rational creatures. The reminiscence of the monstrous period when the Papacy was a football in the hands of bold and dissolute women (904-962), or when mere boys, like Benedict IX. (1033) polluted the Papal crown with the filth of unnatural vices, could not be quite forgotten. The scandal of the Papal schism (1378 to 1409), when two and even three rival Popes excommunicated and cursed each other, and laid all Western Christendom under the ban, excited the moral indignation of all good men in Christendom, and called forth, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, the three Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, which loudly demanded a reformation of the Church, in the head as well as in the members, and asserted the superiority of a Council over the Pope.

The Council of Constance (1414-1418), the most numerous ever seen in the West, deposed two Popes—John XXIII. (the infamous Balthasar Cossa, who had been recognized by the majority of the Church), on the charge of a series of crimes (May 29, 1415), and Benedict XIII., as a heretic who sinned against the unity of the Church (July 26, 1417), and elected a new Pope, Martin V. (Nov. 11, 1517), who had given his adhesion to the Council, though after his accession to power he found ways and means to defeat its real object, i. e., the reformation of the Church.

This Council was a complete triumph of the Episcopal system, and the Papal absolutists and Infallibilists are here forced to the logical dilemma of either admitting the validity of the Council, or invalidating the election of

Martin V. and his successors. Either course is fatal to their system. Hence there has never been an *authoritative* decision on the oecumenicity of this Council, and the only subterfuge is to say that the whole case is an extraordinary exception; but this, after all, involves the admission that there is a higher power in the Church over the Papacy.

The Reformation shook the whole Papacy to its foundation, but could not overthrow it. A powerful reaction followed, headed by the Jesuits. Their General, Lainez, strongly advocated Papal Infallibility in the Council of Trent, and declared that the Church could not err only because the Pope could not err. But the Council left the question undecided, and the Roman Catechism ascribes infallibility simply to "the Catholic Church," without defining its seat. Bellarmin advocated and formularized the doctrine, stating it as an almost general opinion that the Pope could not publicly teach a heretical dogma, and as a probable and pious opinion that Providence will guard him even against private heresy. Yet the same Bellarmin was witness to the innumerable blunders of the edition of the Latin Vulgate prepared by Sixtus V., corrected by his own hand, and issued by him as the only true and authentic text of the sacred Scriptures, with the stereotyped forms of anathema upon all who should venture to change a single word; and Bellarmin himself gave the advice that all copies should be called in, and a new edition printed with a lying statement in the preface making the printers the scape-goats for the errors of the Pope! This whole business of the Vulgate is sufficient to explode Papal Infallibility; for it touches the very source of divine revelation. Other Italian divines, like Alphonsus Liguori, and Jesuitical text-books, unblushingly use long-exploded mediæval fictions and interpolations as a groundwork of Papal absolutism and Infallibility.

It is not necessary to follow the progress of the controversy between the Episcopal and the Papal systems during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is sufficient to say that the greatest Catholic divines of France and Germany, including Bossuet and Möhler, together with many from other countries, down to the 88 protesting Bishops in the Vatican Council, were anti-Infallibilists; and that popular Catechisms of the Roman Church, extensively used till 1870, expressly denied the doctrine, which is now set up as an article of faith necessary to eternal salvation.

Papal Infallibility and the Bible.

The Old Testament gives no tangible aid to the Infallibilists. The Jewish Church existed as a divine institution, and served all its purposes, from Abraham to John the Baptist, without an infallible tribunal in Jerusalem, save the written law and testimony, made effective from time to time by the living voice of inspired prophecy. Pious Israelites found in the Scriptures the way of life, notwithstanding the contradictory interpretations of rabbinical schools and carnal perversions of Messianic prophecies, fostered by a corrupt hierarchy. The Urim and Thummim of the High Priest has no doubt symbolical reference to some kind of spiritual illumination or oracular consultation, but it is of too uncertain interpretation to furnish an argument.

The passages of the New Testament which are used by Roman divines in support of the doctrine of Infallibility may be divided into two classes: those which seem to favor the Episcopal or Gallican, and those which are made to prove the Papal or Ultramontane theory. It is characteristic that the Papal Infallibilists carefully avoid the former.

1. To the first class belong John xiv. 16 sq.; xvi. 18-16, where Christ promises the Holy Ghost to his disciples that he may "abide with them forever," teach them "all things," bring to their remembrance all he had said to them, and guide them "into the whole truth;" John xx. 21: "As the

Father hath sent me, even so send I you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost;," Matt. xviii. 18: "Whatever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," etc.; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20: "Go and disciple all nations . . . and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

These passages, which are addressed to all Apostles alike, to doubting Thomas as well as to Peter, prove indeed the unbroken presence of Christ and the Holy Ghost in the Church to the end of time, which is one of the most precious and glorious truths admitted by every true Christian. But in the first place, the Church, which is here represented by the Apostles, embraces all true believers, laymen as well as Bishops. Secondly, the promise of Christ's presence implies no infallibility, for the same promise is given even to the smallest number of true believers (Matt. xviii. 20). Thirdly, if the passages prove infallibility at all, they would prove individual infallibility by continued inspiration rather than corporate infallibility by official succession; for every Apostle was inspired, and so far infallible; and this no Roman Catholic Bishop, though claiming to be a successor of the Apostles, pretends to be.

2. The passages quoted by the advocates of the Papal theory are three, viz: Luke xxii. 31; Matt. xvi. 18; John xxi. 15.

We admit, at the outset, that these passages in their obvious meaning, which is confirmed by the history of the Apostolic Church, assign to Peter a certain primacy among the Apostles: he was the leader and the spokesman of them, and the chief agent of Christ in laying the foundations of his Church among the Jews and the Gentiles. This is significantly prophesied in the new name of Peter given to him. The history of Pentecost (Acts ii.) and the conversion of Cornelius (Acts x.) are the fulfilment of this prophecy, and furnish the key to the interpretation of the passages in the Gospels.

This is the truth which underlies the colossal lie of the Papacy. For there is no Romish error which does not derive its life and force from some truth. But beyond this we have no right to go. The position which Peter occupied no one can occupy after him. The foundation of the Church, once laid, is laid for all time to come, and the gates of Hades can not prevail against it. The New Testament is its own best interpreter. It shows no single example of an exercise of jurisdiction of Peter over the other Apostles, but the very reverse. He himself, in his Epistles, disowns and prophetically warns his fellow-presbyters against the hierarchical spirit; exhorting them, instead of being lords over God's heritage, to be ensamples to his flock (1 Pet. v. 1-4). Paul and John were perfectly independent of him, as the Acts and Epistles prove. Paul even openly administered to him a rebuke at Antioch. At the Council of Jerusalem James seems to have presided, at all events he proposed the compromise which was adopted by the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren; Peter was indeed one of the leading speakers, but he significantly advocated the truly evangelical principle of salvation by faith alone, and protested against human bondage (Acts xv.; comp. Gall. ii.).

The great error of the Papacy is that it perverts a primacy of honor into a supremacy of jurisdiction, a personal privilege into an official prerogative, and a priority of time into a permanent superiority of rank. And to make the above passages at all available for such purpose, it must take for granted, as intervening links of the argument, that which can not be proved from the New Testament nor from history, viz., that Peter was Bishop of Rome; that he was there as Paul's superior; that he appointed a successor, and transferred to him his prerogatives.

As to the passages separately considered, Matt. xvi., "Thou art rock," and John xxi., "Feed my flock," could at best only prove Papal absolutism, but not Papal Infallibility, of which they do not treat. The former teaches

the indestructibility of the Church in its totality (not of any individual congregation), but this is a different idea. The Council of Trent lays down "the unanimous consent of the Fathers" as the norm and rule of all orthodox interpretation, as if exegetical wisdom had begun and ended with the divines of the first six centuries. But of the passage Matt. xvi., which is more frequently quoted by Popes and Papists than any other passage in the Bible, there are no less than five different patristic interpretations; the rock on which Christ built his Church being referred to *Christ* by sixteen Fathers (including Augustine); to the *faith* or *confession* of Peter by forty-four (including Chrysostom, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, and Augustine again); to *Peter* professing the faith by seventeen; to *all the Apostles*, whom Peter represented by his primacy, by eight; to *all the faithful*, who, believing in Christ as the Son of God, are constituted the living stones of the Church. But not one of the Fathers finds Papal Infallibility in this passage, nor in John xxi. The "unanimous consent of the Fathers" is a pure fiction, except in the most general and fundamental principles held by all Christians; and not to interpret the Bible *except* according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, would strictly mean not to interpret it at all.

There remains, then, only the passage recorded by Luke (xii. 81, 82) as at all bearing on the disputed question: "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan desired to have you (or, obtained you by asking), that he may sift you as wheat; but I prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou, when once thou art converted (or, hast turned again), strengthen thy brethren." But even this does not prove infallibility, and has not been so understood before Popes Leo I. and Agatho. For (1) the passage refers, as the context shows, to the peculiar personal history of Peter during the dark hour of passion, and is both a warning and a comfort to him. So it is explained by the Fathers, who frequently quote it. (2) Faith here, as nearly always in the New Testament, means personal trust in, and attachment to, Christ, and not, as the Romish Church misinterprets it, orthodoxy, or intellectual assent to dogmas. (3) If the passage refers to the Popes at all, it would prove too much for them, viz., that they, like Peter, denied the Saviour, were converted again, and strengthened their brethren—which may be true enough of some, but certainly not of all.

The constant appeal of the Roman Church to Peter suggests a significant parallel. There is a spiritual Peter and a carnal Simon, who are separated, indeed, by regeneration, yet after all, not so completely that the old nature does not occasionally re-appear in the new man.

It was the spiritual Peter who forsook all to follow Christ; who first confessed him as the Son of God, and hence was called Rock; who after his terrible fall wept bitterly; was re-instated and entrusted with the care of Christ's sheep; who on the birthday of the Church preached the first missionary sermon, and gathered in three thousand converts; who in the Apostles' Council protested against the narrow bigotry of the Judaizers, and stood up with Paul for the principle of salvation by grace alone through faith in Christ; who, in his Epistles, warns all ministers against hierarchical pride, and exhibits a wonderful meekness, gentleness, and humility of spirit, showing that divine grace had overruled and sanctified to him even his fall; and who followed at last his Master to the cross of martyrdom.

It was the carnal Simon who presumed to divert his Lord from the path of suffering, and drew on him the rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art a stumbling-block unto me, for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men"; the Simon who, in mistaken zeal, used the sword and cut off the ear of Malchus; who proudly boasted of his unswerving fidelity to his Master, and yet a few hours afterwards denied him thrice before a

servant-woman; who even after the Pentecostal illumination was overcome by his natural weakness, and from policy or fear of the Judaizing party, was untrue to his better convictions, so as to draw on him the public rebuke of the younger Apostle of the Gentiles. The Romish Legend of *Domine quo vadis* makes him relapse into his inconstancy even a day before his martyrdom, and memorializes it in a chapel outside of Rome.

The reader may judge whether the history of the Popes reflect more the character of the spiritual Peter or the carnal Simon. If the Apostolic Church prophetically anticipates and foreshadows the whole course of Christian history, the temporary collision of Peter, the Apostle of the circumcision, and Paul, the Apostle of the uncircumcision, at Antioch, is a significant type of the antagonism between Romanism and Protestantism, between the Church of the binding law and the Church of the free gospel.

SYLLABUS ERRORUM.

[THE PAPAL SYLLABUS OF ERRORS. A. D. 1864.]

[This document, though issued by the sole authority of Pope Pius IX., Dec. 8, 1864, must be regarded now as infallible and irreformable, even without the formal sanction of the Vatican Council. It is purely negative, but indirectly it teaches and enjoins the very opposite of what it condemns as error.]

Syllabus complectens præcipuos nostræ ætatis Errores qui notantur in Allocutionibus Consistorialibus, in Encyclicis, aliisque Apostolicis Letteris Sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii Papæ IX.

The Syllabus of the principal errors of our time, which are stigmatized in the Consistorial Allocutions, Encyclicals, and other Apostolical Letters of our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius IX.

§ I.—PANTHEISMUS, NATURALISMUS ET RATIONALISMUS ABSOLUTUS.

§ I.—PANTHEISM, NATURALISM, AND ABSOLUTE RATIONALISM.

1. Nullum supremum, sapientissimum, providentissimumque Numen divinum existit ab hac rerum universitate distinctum, et Deus idem est ac rerum natura et iccirco immutationibus obnoxius, Deusque reapse fit in homine et mundo, atque omnia Deus sunt et ipsissimam Dei habent substantiam; ac una eademque res est Deus cum mundo, et proinde spiritus cum materia, necessitas cum libertate, verum cum falso, bonum cum malo, et justum cum injusto.

1. There exists no supreme, most wise, and most provident divine being distinct from the universe, and God is none other than nature, and is therefore subject to change. In effect, God is produced in man and in the world, and all things are God, and have the very substance of God. God is therefore one and the same thing with the world, and thence spirit is the same thing with matter, necessity with liberty, true with false, good with evil, justice with injustice.

2. Neganda est omnis Dei actio in homines et mundum.

2. All action of God upon man and the world is to be denied.

3. Humana ratio, nullo prorsus Dei respectu habito, unicus est veri et falsi, boni et mali arbiter, sibi ipsi est lex et naturalibus suis viribus ad hominum ac populorum bonum curandum sufficit.

3. Human reason, without any regard to God, is the sole arbiter of truth and falsehood, of good and evil; it is its own law to itself, and suffices by its natural force to secure the welfare of men and of nations.

4. Omnes religionis veritates ex nativa humanæ rationis vi derivant; hinc ratio est princeps norma, qua homo cognitionem omnium ejusque generis veritatum assequi possit ac debeat.

4. All the truths of religion are derived from the native strength of human reason; whence reason is the master rule by which man can and ought to arrive at the knowledge of all truths of every kind.

5. Divina revelatio est imperfecta et iccirco subjecta continuo et indefinito progressui, qui humanæ rationis progressionem consequatur.

5. Divine revelation is imperfect, and, therefore, subject to a continual and indefinite progress, which corresponds with the progress of human reason.

6. Christi fides humanæ refragatur rationi; divinaque revelatio non solum nihil prodest, verum etiam nocet hominis perfectioni.

6. Christian faith contradicts human reason, and divine revelation not only does not benefit, but even injures the perfection of man.

7. Prophetiæ et miracula in Sacris Litteris exposita et narrata sunt poetarum commenta, et Christianæ fidei mysteria philosophicarum investigationum summa; et utriusque Testamenti libris mythica continentur inventa; ipseque Jesus Christus est mythica fictio.

7. The prophecies and miracles set forth and narrated in the Sacred Scriptures are the fictions of poets; and the mysteries of the Christian faith are the result of philosophical investigations. In the books of both Testaments there are contained mythical inventions, and Jesus Christ is himself a mythical fiction.

§ II.—PATIIONALISMUS MODERATUS.

8. Quum ratio humana ipsi religioni equiparetur, laicis theologicæ disciplinæ perinde ac philosophicæ tractandæ sunt.

8. As human reason is placed on a level with religion, so theological matters must be treated in the same manner as philosophical ones.

9. Omnia indiscriminatim dogmata religionis Christianæ sunt objectum naturalis scientiæ seu philosophiæ; et humana ratio historice tantum exulta potest ex suis naturalibus viribus et principiis ad veram de omnibus etiam reconditis dogmatibus scientiam pervenire, modo hæc dogmata ipsi rationi tanquam objectum proposita fuerint.

9. All the dogmas of the Christian religion are, without exception, the object of scientific knowledge or philosophy, and human reason, instructed solely by history, is able, by its own natural strength and principles, to arrive at the true knowledge of even the most abstruse dogmas: provided such dogmas be proposed as subject-matter for human reason.

10. Quum aliud sit philosophus, aliud philosophia, ille jus et officium habet se submittendi auctoritati, quam veram ipse probaverit; at philosophia neque potest, neque debet ulli sese submittere auctoritati.

10. As the philosopher is one thing, and philosophy is another, so it is the right and duty of the philosopher to submit to the authority which he shall have recognized as true; but philosophy neither can nor ought to submit to any authority.

11. Ecclesia non solum non debet in philosophiam unquam animadvertere, verum etiam debet ipsius philosophiæ tolerare errores, eique relinquere ut ipsa se corrigat.

11. The Church not only ought never to animadvert upon philosophy, but ought to tolerate the errors of philosophy, leaving to philosophy the care of their correction.

12. Apostolicæ Sedis, Romanarumque Congregationum decreta liberum scientiæ progressum impediunt.

12. The decrees of the Apostolic See and of the Roman Congregations fetter the free progress of science.

13. Methodus et principia, quibus antiqui Doctores scholastici Theologiam excoluerunt, temporum nostrorum necessitatibus scientiarumque progressui minime congruunt.

13. The method and principles by which the old scholastic doctors cultivated theology are no longer suitable to the demands of the age and the progress of science.

14. Philosophia tractanda est, nulla supernaturalis revelationis habita ratione.

14. Philosophy must be treated or without any account being taken of supernatural revelation.

§ III.—INDIFFERENTISMUS, LATITUDINARIANISMUS.

15. Liberum cuique homini est eam amplecti ac profiteri religionem, quam rationis lumine quis ductus veram putaverit.

16. Homines in cujusvis religionis cultu viam æternæ salutis reperire æternamque salutem assequi possunt.

17. Saltem bene sperandum est de æterna illorum omnium salute, qui in vera Christi Ecclesia nequam versantur.

18. Protestantismus non aliud est quam diversa versæ ejusdem Christianæ religionis forma, in qua aequè ac in Ecclesia Catholica Deo placere datum est.

§ IV.—SOCIALISMUS, COMMUNISMUS, SOCIETATES CLANDESTINÆ, SOCIETATES BIBLICÆ, SOCIETATES CLERICO-LIBERALES.

Ejusmodi pestes sæpe gravissimæque verborum formulis reprobantur in Epist. encycl. Qui pluribus, 9 novembr. 1846; in Alloc. Quibus quantisque 20 april. 1849; in Epist. encycl. Noscitis et Nobiscum 8 dec. 1849; in Alloc. Singulæ quadam 9 dec. 1854; in Epist. encycl. Quanto conficiamur mœore 10 augusti 1863.

§ V.—ERRORES DE ECCLESIA EJUSQUE JURIS.

19. Ecclesia non est vera perfecta que societas plane libera, nec pollet suis propriis et constantibus juribus sibi a divino suo fundatore collatis, sed civilis potestatis est definire quæ sint Ecclesiæ jura ac limites, intra quos eadem jura exercere queat.

20. Ecclesiastica potestas suam auctoritatem exercere non debet absque civilis gubernii venia et assensu.

21. Ecclesia non habet potestatem dogmaticæ definiendi, religionem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ esse unice veram religionem.

§ III.—INDIFFERENTISM, LATITUDINARIANISM.

15. Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason.

16. Men may in any religion find the way of eternal salvation, and obtain eternal salvation.

17. We may entertain at least a well-founded hope for the eternal salvation of all those who are in no manner in the true Church of Christ.

18. Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion, in which it is possible to be equally pleasing to God as in the Catholic Church.

§ IV.—SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, SECRET SOCIETIES, BIBLICAL SOCIETIES, CLERICO-LIBERAL SOCIETIES.

Pests of this description are frequently rebuked in the severest terms in the Encyc. *Qui pluribus*, Nov. 9, 1846; Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, April 20, 1849; Encyc. *Noscitis et Nobiscum*, Dec. 8, 1849; Alloc. *Singulæ quadam*, Dec. 9, 1854; Encyc. *Quanto conficiamur mœore*, Aug. 10, 1863.

§ V.—ERRORS CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND HER RIGHTS.

19. The Church is not a true, and perfect, and entirely free society; nor does she enjoy peculiar and perpetual rights conferred upon her by her Divine Founder, but it appertains to the civil power to define what are the rights and limits with which the Church may exercise authority.

20. The ecclesiastical power must not exercise its authority without the permission and assent of the civil government.

21. The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion.

22. Obligatio, qua Catholici magistri et scriptores omnino adstringuntur, coarctantur in his tantum, quae ab infallibili Ecclesiae iudicio veluti fidei dogmata ab omnibus credenda proponuntur.

23. Romani Pontifices et Concilia oecumenica a limitibus suae potestatis recesserunt, jura principum usurparunt, atque etiam in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errarunt.

24. Ecclesia vis inferendae potestatem non habet, neque potestatem ullam temporalem directam vel indirectam.

25. Praeter potestatem Episcopatus inherentem, alia est attributa temporalis potestas a civili imperio vel expresse vel tacite concessa, revocanda propterea, cum libuerit, a civili imperio.

26. Ecclesia non habet nativum ac legitimum jus acquirendi ac possidendi.

27. Sacri Ecclesiae ministri Romanusque Pontifex ab omni rerum temporalium cura ac dominio sunt omnino excludendi.

28. Episcopis, sine gubernii venia, fas non est vel ipsas apostolicas litteras promulgare.

29. Gratiae a Romano Pontifice concessae existimari debent tamquam irritae, nisi per gubernium fuerint imploratae.

30. Ecclesiae et personarum ecclesiasticarum immunitas a jure civili ortum habuit.

31. Ecclesiasticum forum pro temporalibus clericorum causis sive civilibus sive criminalibus omnino de medio tollendum est, etiam inconsulta et reclamante Apostolica Sede.

32. Absque ulla naturalia jura et aequitatis violatione potest abrogari personalis immunitas, qua clerici ab onere subeundi exercendaeque militiae eximuntur; hanc vero abrogationem postulat civilis progressus maxime in societate ad formam liberi regiminis constituta.

22. The obligation which binds Catholic teachers and authors applies only to those things which are proposed for universal belief as dogmas of the faith, by the infallible judgment of the Church.

23. The Roman Pontiffs and oecumenical Councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals.

24. The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power.

25. In addition to the authority inherent in the Episcopate, a further and temporal power is granted to it by the civil authority, either expressly or tacitly, which power is on that account also revocable by the civil authority whenever it pleases.

26. The Church has not the innate and legitimate right of acquisition and possession.

27. The ministers of the Church, and the Roman Pontiff, ought to be absolutely excluded from all charge and dominion over temporal affairs.

28. Bishops have not the right of promulgating even their apostolical letters, without the permission of the government.

29. Dispensations granted by the Roman Pontiff must be considered null, unless they have been asked for by the civil government.

30. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons derives its origin from civil law.

31. Ecclesiastical courts for temporal causes, of the clergy, whether civil or criminal, ought by all means to be abolished, either without the concurrence and against the protest of the Holy See.

32. The personal immunity exempting the clergy from military service may be abolished, without violation either of natural right or of equity. Its abolition is called for by civil progress, especially in a community constituted upon principles of liberal government.

33. Non pertinet unice ad ecclesiasticam jurisdictionis potestatem proprio ac nativo jure dirigere theologiarum rerum doctrinam.

34. Doctrina comparantium Romanum Pontificem principi libero et agenti in universa Ecclesia doctrina est quas medio ævo prævaluit.

35. Nihil vetat, alicujus concilii generalis sententia aut universorum populorum facto, summum Pontificatum ab Romano Episcopo atque Urbe ad alium Episcopum aliamque civitatem transferri.

36. Nationalis concilii definitio nullam aliam admittit disputationem, civilisque administratio rem ad hosce terminos exigere potest.

37. Institui possunt nationales Ecclesie ab auctoritate Romani Pontificis subductæ planeque divise.

38. Divisioni Ecclesie in orientalem atque occidentalem nimia Romanorum Pontificum arbitria contulerunt.

§ VI.—ERRORS DE SOCIETATE CIVILI
TUM IN SE, TUM IN SUI AD ECCLESIAM
RELATIONIBUS SPECTATA.

39. Reipublicæ status, utpote omnium jurium origo et fons, jure quodam pollet nullis circumscripto limitibus.

40. Catholice Ecclesia doctrina humane societatis bono et commodis adversatur.

41. Civili potestati vel ab infideli imperante exercitæ competit potestas indirecta negativa in sacra; eidem proinde competit nedum jus quod vocant *exequatur*, sed etiam *jus appellationis*, quam nuncupant, *ab abusu*.

42. In conflictu legum utriusque potestatis jus civile prævalet.

43. Laica potestas auctoritatem habet rescindendi, declarandi ac faci-

33. It does not appertain exclusively to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by any right, proper and inherent, to direct the teaching of theological subjects.

34. The teaching of those who compare the sovereign Pontiff to a free sovereign acting in the universal Church is a doctrine which prevailed in the middle ages.

35. There would be no obstacle to the sentence of a general council, or the act of all the universal peoples, transferring the pontifical sovereignty from the Bishop and City of Rome to some other bishopric and some other city.

36. The definition of a national council does not admit of any subsequent discussion, and the civil power can regard as settled an affair decided by such national council.

37. National churches can be established, after being withdrawn and plainly separated from the authority of the Roman Pontiff.

38. Roman Pontiffs have, by their too arbitrary conduct, contributed to the division of the Church into eastern and western.

§ VI.—ERRORS ABOUT CIVIL SOCIETY,
CONSIDERED BOTH IN ITSELF AND IN
ITS RELATION TO THE CHURCH.

39. The commonwealth is the origin and source of all rights, and possesses rights which are not circumscribed by any limits.

40. The teaching of the Catholic Church is opposed to the well-being and interests of society.

41. The civil power, even when exercised by an unbelieving sovereign, possesses an indirect and negative power over religious affairs. It therefore possesses not only the right called that of *exequatur*, but that of the (so-called) *appellatio ab abusu*.

42. In the case of conflicting laws between the two powers, the civil law ought to prevail.

43. The civil power has a right to break, and to declare and render null,

endi irritas solennes conventiones (vulgo *Concordate*) super usu iurium ad ecclesiasticam immunitatem pertinentium cum Sede Apostolica initas, sine hujus consensu, immo et ea reclamante.

44. Civilis auctoritas potest se immiscere rebus que ad religionem, mores et regimen spirituale pertinent. Hinc potest de instructionibus judicare, quas Ecclesie pastores ad conscientiarum normam pro suo munere edunt, quin etiam potest de divinorum sacramentorum administratione et dispositionibus ad ea suscipienda necessariis decernere.

45. Totum scholarum publicarum regimen, in quibus juvenus Christiana alioquin republice instituitur, episcopali bus dumtaxat seminariis aliqua ratione exceptis, potest ac debet attribui auctoritati civili, et ita quidem attribui, ut nullam alii cuiusque auctoritati recognoscatur jus immiscendi se in disciplina scholarum, in regimine studiorum, in gradu collatione, in dilectu aut approbatione magistrorum.

46. Immo in ipsis clericorum seminariis methodus studiorum adhibenda civili auctoritati subieitur.

47. Postulat optima civilis societatis ratio, ut populares scholæ, quæ patent omnibus cujusque e populo classis pueris, ac publica universim instituta, quæ litteris severioribusque disciplinis tradendis et educationi juventutis curandæ sunt destinata, eximantur ab omni Ecclesie auctoritate, moderatrice vi et ingerentia, plenoque civilis ac politicæ auctoritatis arbitrio subiciantur ad imperantium placita et ad communium ætatis opinionum amussim.

48. Catholicis viris probari potest ea juventutis instituendæ ratio, quæ sit a Catholica fide et ab Ecclesiæ potestate sejuncta, quæque rerum dumtaxat naturalium scientiam ac terrenæ socialis vitæ fines tantummodo vel saltem primario spectet.

the conventions (commonly called *Concordate*) concluded with the Apostolic See, relative to the use of rights appertaining to the ecclesiastical immunity, without the consent of the Holy See, and even contrary to its protest.

44. The civil authority may interfere in matters relating to religion, morality, and spiritual government. Hence it has control over the instructions for the guidance of consciences issued, conformably with their mission, by the pastors of the Church. Further, it possesses power to decree, in the matter of administering the divine sacraments, as to the dispositions necessary for their reception.

45. The entire direction of public schools, in which the youth of Christian states are educated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of episcopal seminaries, may and must appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the taking of degrees, or the choice and approval of the teachers.

46. Much more, even in clerical seminaries, the method of study to be adopted is subject to the civil authority.

47. The best theory of civil society requires that popular schools open to the children of all classes, and, generally, all public institutes intended for instruction in letters and philosophy, and for conducting the education of the young, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, government, and interference, and should be fully subject to the civil and political power. In conformity with the will of rulers and the prevalent opinions of the age.

48. This system of instructing youth, which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church, and in teaching exclusively, or at least primarily, the knowledge of natural things and the earthly ends of social life alone may be approved by Catholics.

49. Civilis auctoritas potest impedire quominus auctorum antistites et fideles populi cum Romano Pontifice libere ac mutuo communicent.

50. Laica auctoritas habet per se jus præsentandi episcopos et potest ab illis exigere, ut ineant diocesani procuracionem, antequam ipsi canonicam a S. Sede institutionem et apostolicas litteras accipiant.

51. Immo laicum gubernium habet jus deponendi ab exercitio pastoralis ministerii episcopos, neque tenetur obedire Romano Pontifici in iis quæ episcopatum et episcoporum respiciunt institutionem.

52. Gubernium potest suo jure immutare statum ab Ecclesia præscriptam pro religiosa tam mulierum quam virorum professione, omnibusque religiosis familiis indicere, ut neminem sine suo permissu ad solemnia vota nuncupanda admittant.

53. Abrogandæ sunt leges quæ ad religionarum familiarum statum tutandum, earumque jura et officia pertinent; immo potest civile gubernium iis omnibus auxilium præstare, qui a suscepto religiosa vite instituto deficere ac solemnia vota frangere velint; pariterque potest religiosas easdem familias perinde ac collegiatis Ecclesiis, et beneficia simplicia etiam juris patronatus penitus extinguere, illorumque bona et redditus civilis potestatis administrationi ei arbitrio subicere et vindicare.

54. Reges et principes non solum ab Ecclesiæ jurisdictione eximuntur, verum etiam in questionibus jurisdictionis dirimendis superiores sunt Ecclesiæ.

55. Ecclesiæ a Statu, Statusque ab Ecclesiæ sejungendus est.

§ VII.—ERRORES DE ETHICA NATURALI ET CHRISTIANA.

56. Morum leges divina haud egent sanctione, minimeque opus est ut humane leges ad naturæ jus confir-

49. The civil power has the right to prevent ministers of religion, and the faithful, from communicating freely and mutually with each other, and with the Roman Pontiff.

50. The secular authority possesses, as inherent in itself, the right of presenting bishops, and may require of them that they take possession of their dioceses before having received canonical institution and the apostolic letters from the Holy See.

51. And, further, the secular government has the right of deposing bishops from their pastoral functions, and it is not bound to obey the Roman Pontiff in those things which relate to episcopal sees and the institution of bishops.

52. The government has of itself the right to alter the age prescribed by the Church for the religious profession, both of men and women; and it may enjoin upon all religious establishments to admit no person to take solemn vows without its permission.

53. The laws for the protection of religious establishments, and securing their rights and duties, ought to be abolished; nay, more, the civil government may lend its assistance to all who desire to quit the religious life they have undertaken, and break their vows. The government may also suppress religious orders, collegiate churches, and simple benefices, even those belonging to private patronage, and submit their goods and revenues to the administration and disposal of the civil power.

54. Kings and princes are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but are superior to the Church, in litigated questions of jurisdiction.

55. The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.

§ VII.—ERRORS CONCERNING NATURAL AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

56. Moral laws do not stand in need of the divine sanction, and there is no necessity that human laws should

mentur aut obligandi vim a Deo accipiant.

57. Philosophicarum rerum morumque scientia, itemque civiles leges possunt et debent a divina et ecclesiastica auctoritate declinare.

58. Alia vires non sunt agnoscendæ nisi illæ quæ in materia positæ sunt, et omnis morum disciplina honestasque collocari debet in cumulandis et augendis quovis modo divitiis ac in voluptatibus explendis.

59. Jus in materiali facto consistit, et omnia hominum officia sunt nomen inane, et omnia humana facta juris vim habent.

60. Auctoritas nihil aliqd est nisi numeri et materialium virium summa.

61. Fortunata facti injustitia nullum juris scientiæ detrimentum affert.

62. Proclamandum est et observandum principium quod vocant de non-interventio.

63. Legitimis principibus obedientiam detrectare, immo et rebellare licet.

64. Tum cujusque sanctissimi juramenti violatio, tum quælibet scelestæ flagitiosæque actio sempiternæ legi repugnans, non solum haud est improbanda, verum etiam omnino licita, summiisque laudibus efferenda, quando id pro patriæ amore agatur.

§ VIII.—ERRORES DE MATRIMONIO CHRISTIANO.

65. Nulla ratione ferri potest, Christum exuisse matrimonium ad dignitatem sacramenti.

66. Matrimonii sacramentum non est nisi quid contractui accessorium ab eoque separabile, ipsumque sacramentum in una tantum nuptiali benedictione situm est.

67. Jure naturæ matrimonii vinculum non est indissolubile et in variis casibus divortium proprie dic-

be conformable to the law of nature, and receive their sanction from God.

57. Knowledge of philosophical things and morals, and also civil laws, may and must depart from divine and ecclesiastical authority.

58. No other forces are to be recognized than those which reside in matter; and all moral teaching and moral excellence ought to be made to consist in the accumulation and increase of riches by every possible means, and in the enjoyment of pleasure.

59. Right consists in the material fact, and all human duties are but vain words, and all human acts have the force of right.

60. Authority is nothing else but the result of numerical superiority and material force.

61. An unjust act, being successful, inflicts no injury upon the sanctity of right.

62. The principle of non-intervention, as it is called, ought to be proclaimed and adhered to.

63. It is allowable to refuse obedience to legitimate princes; nay, more, to rise in insurrection against them.

64. The violation of a solemn oath, even every wicked and flagitious action repugnant to the eternal law, is not only not blamable, but quite lawful, and worthy of the highest praise, when done for the love of country.

§ VIII.—THE ERRORS CONCERNING CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

65. It can not be by any means tolerated, to maintain that Christ has raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament.

66. The sacrament of marriage is only an adjunct of the contract, and separable from it, and the sacrament itself consists in the nuptial benediction alone.

67. By the law of nature, the marriage tie is not indissoluble, and in many cases divorce, properly so called,

tum auctoritate civili sanciri potest.

68. Ecclesia non habet potestatem impedimenta matrimonium dirimentia inducendi, sed ea potestas civili auctoritati competit, a qua impedimenta existentia tollenda sunt.

69. Ecclesia sequioribus sæculis dirimentia impedimenta inducere cepit, non jure proprio, sed illo jure usa, quod a civili potestate mutuata erat.

70. Tridentini canones, qui anathematis censuram illis inferunt, qui facultatem impedimenta dirimentia inducendi Ecclesiam negare audeant, vel non sunt dogmatici vel de hac mutuata potestate intelligendi sunt.

71. Tridentini forma sub infirmitatis poena non obligat, ubi lex civilis aliam formam præstituat, et velit hæc nova forma interveniente matrimonium valere.

72. Bonifacius VIII. votum castitatis in ordinatione emissum nuptias nullas reddere primus asseruit.

73. Vi contractus mere civilis potest inter Christianos constare vari nominis matrimonium; falsumque est, aut contractum matrimonii inter Christianos semper esse sacramentum, aut nullum esse contractum, si sacramentum excludatur.

74. Causæ matrimoniales et sponsalia superte natura ad forum civile pertinent.

§ IX.—ERRORES DE CIVILI ROMANI PONTIFICIS PRINCIPATU.

75. De temporalis regni cum spirituali compatibilitate disputant inter se Christianæ et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filii.

76. Abrogatio civilis imperii, quo Apostolica Sedes potitur, ad Ecclesiæ libertatem felicitatemque vel maxime conducet.

may be pronounced by the civil authority.

68. The Church has not the power of laying down what are diriment impediments to marriage. The civil authority does possess such a power, and can do away with existing impediments to marriage.

69. The Church only commenced in latter ages to bring in diriment impediments, and then availing herself of a right not her own, but borrowed from the civil power.

70. The canons of the Council of Trent, which pronounce censure of anathema against those who deny to the Church the right of laying down what are diriment impediments, either are not dogmatic, or must be understood as referring only to such borrowed power.

71. The form of solemnizing marriage prescribed by the said Council, under penalty of nullity, does not bind in cases where the civil law has appointed another form, and where it decrees that this new form shall effectuate a valid marriage.

72. Boniface VIII. is the first who declared that the vow of chastity pronounced at ordination annuls nuptials.

73. A merely civil contract may, among Christians, constitute a true marriage; and it is false, either that the marriage contract between Christians is always a sacrament, or that the contract is null, if the sacrament be excluded.

74. Matrimonial causes and sponsals belong by their very nature to civil jurisdiction.

§ IX.—ERRORS REGARDING THE CIVIL POWER OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF.

75. The children of the Christian and Catholic Church are not agreed upon the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power.

76. The abolition of the temporal power, of which the Apostolic See is possessed, would contribute in the greatest degree to the liberty and prosperity of the Church.

§ X.—ERRORS QUI AD LIBERALISMUM
HODIERNUM REFERUNTUR.

§ X.—ERRORS HAVING REFERENCE TO
MODERN LIBERALISM.

77. *Etate hac nostra non amplius expedit, religionem Catholicam haberi tamquam unicam Status religionem, ceteris quibuscumque cultibus exclusis.*

77. In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.

78. *Hinc laudabiliter in quibusdam Catholici nominis regionibus lege cantum est, ut hominibus illuc immigrantibus liceat publicum proprii cuiusque cultus exercitium habere.*

78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.

79. *Enimvero falsum est, civilem cuiusque cultus libertatem, itemque plenam potestatem omnibus attributam quaslibet opiniones cogitationesque palam publiceque manifestandi conducere ad populorum mores animosque facilius corrumpendos ac indifferentismi pestem propagandam.*

79. Moreover, it is false that the civil liberty of every mode of worship, and the full power given to all of overtly and publicly manifesting their opinions and their ideas, of all kinds whatsoever, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to the propagation of the pest of indifference.

80. *Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere.*

80. The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and civilization as lately introduced.

the civil au-
the power
e diriment
The civil
n a power,
ting impe-

nnounced in
iriment im-
ling herself
t borrowed

Council of
censure of
ho deny to
ying down
ents, eith-
must be
nly to such

izing mar-
id Council,
does not
ll law has
and where
form shall

e first who
of chastity
on annula

tract may,
ute a true
either that
ween Chris-
nt, or that
sacrament

s and es-
y nature to

THE CIVIL
PONTIFF.

e Christian
not agreed
ne temporal

e temporal
olic See is
ute in the
y and pros-

DECRETA DOGMATICA CONCILII VATICANI DE FIDE CATHOLICA ET DE ECCLESIA CHRISTI.

[THE DOGMATIC DECREES OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL CONCERNING THE
CATHOLIC FAITH AND THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. A.D. 1870.]

[The Latin text from *Acta et Decreta sacrosancti et œcumenici Concilii Vaticani*, etc. cum permissione superiorum, Friburgi Brisgovie, 1871, Fasc. II. pp. 170-179, and 181-187. The English translation from Archbishop MANNING: *Petri Privilegium*, London, 1871, Part III. pp. 192-202, and 211-219. On the Vatican Council, see the preceding history.]

CONSTITUTIO DOGMATICA DE FIDE CATHOLICA.

*sessio III. Habita die 24 Aprilis,
1870.*

PIUS EPISCOPUS, SERVUS SERVORUM
DEI, SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO,
AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Dei Filius et generis humani Redemptor, Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, ad Patrem cœlestem rediturus, cum Ecclesia sua in terris militante omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi futurum se esse promisit. Quare dilectæ sponsæ preste esse, adistere docenti, operanti benedicere, periclitanti opem ferre nullo unquam tempore destitit. Hæc vero salutaris ejus providentia, cum ex aliis beneficiis innumeris continenter apparuit, tum iis manifestissime comperta est fructibus, qui orbi Christiano e Conciliis œcumenicis, ac nominatim e Tridentino, iniquis licet temporibus celebrato, amplissimi provenerunt. Hinc enim sanctissima religionis dogmata pressius definita uberiusque exposita, errores damnati atque cohibiti; hinc ecclesiastica disciplina restituta firmissimæ sancita, promotum in clero scientiæ et pietatis studium, parata adolescentibus ad sacram militiam educandis collegia, Christiani denique populi mores et accuratiore fidelium eruditione et frequentiore sacramentorum usu instaurati. Hinc præterea artior membro-

DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

*Published in the Third Session, held
April 24, 1870.*

PIUS, BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SACRED COUNCIL, FOR PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and Redeemer of Mankind, before returning to his heavenly Father, promised that he would be with the Church Militant on earth all days, even to the consummation of the world. Therefore, he has never ceased to be present with his beloved Spouse, to assist her when teaching, to bless her when at work, and to aid her when in danger. And this his salutary providence, which has been constantly displayed by other innumerable benefits, has been most manifestly proved by the abundant good results which Christendom has derived from œcumenical Councils, and particularly from that of Trent, although it was held in evil times. For, as a consequence, the sacred doctrines of the faith have been defined more closely, and set forth more fully, errors have been condemned and restrained, ecclesiastical discipline has been restored and more firmly secured, the love of learning and of piety has been promoted among the clergy, colleges have been established to educate youth for the sacred warfare, and the

rum cum visibili Capite communio, universoque corpori Christi mystico additus vigor; hinc religiose multiplicata familiae aliaque Christianae pietatis instituta; hinc ille etiam assiduus et usque ad sanguinis effusionem constans ardor in Christi regno late per orbem propagando.

morals of the Christian world have been renewed by the more accurate training of the faithful, and by the more frequent use of the sacraments. Moreover, there has resulted a closer communion of the members with the visible head, an increase of vigor in the whole mystical body of Christ, the multiplication of religious congregations, and of other institutions of Christian piety, and such ardor in extending the kingdom of Christ throughout the world as constantly endures, even to the sacrifice of life itself.

But while we recall with due thankfulness these and other signal benefits which the divine mercy has bestowed on the Church, especially by the last oecumenical Council, we cannot restrain our bitter sorrow for the grave evils, which are principally due to the fact that the authority of that sacred Synod has been contemned, or its wise decrees neglected, by many.

No one is ignorant that the heresies proscribed by the Fathers of Trent, by which the divine magisterium of the Church was rejected, and all matters regarding religion were surrendered to the judgment of each individual, gradually became dissolved into many sects, which disagreed and contended with one another, until at length not a few lost all faith in Christ. Even the Holy Scriptures, which had previously been declared the sole source and judge of Christian doctrine, began to be ranked among the fictions of mythology.

Tum nata est et late nimis per orbem vagata illa rationalismi seu naturalismi doctrina, quae religioni Christianae utpote supernaturali instituto per omnia adversans, summo studio molitur, ut Christo, qui solus Dominus et Salvator noster est, a mentibus humanis, a vita et moribus populorum excluso, mera quod vocant rationis vel naturae regnum stabiliatur. Relicta autem projectaque Christiana religione, negato vero Deo et Christo eius, prolapsa tandem est multorum

Then there arose, and too widely overspread the world, that doctrine of rationalism, or naturalism, which opposes itself in every way to the Christian religion as a supernatural institution, and works with the utmost zeal in order that, after Christ, our sole Lord and Saviour, has been excluded from the minds of men, and from the life and moral acts of nations, the reign of what they call pure reason or nature may be established. And after forsaking and rejecting the

mens in Pantheismi, Materialismi, Atheismi barathrum, ut jam ipsam rationalem naturam, omnemque justitiam rectique normam negantes, ima humanæ societatis fundamenta diruere conantur.

Hac porro impietate circumquaque grassante, infelicitate contigit, ut plures etiam et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filii a via veræ pietatis aberrarent, in hisque, diminutis paullatim veritatibus, sensus Catholicus attenuaretur. Variis enim ac peregrinis doctrinis abducti, naturam et gratiam, scientiam humanam et fidem divinam perperam commiscuentes, genuinum sensum dogmatum, quem tenet ac docet sancta mater Ecclesia, depravare, integritatemque et sinceritatem fidei in periculum adducere comperiuntur.

Quibus omnibus perspectis, fieri qui potest, ut non commoveantur intima Ecclesiæ viscera? Quemadmodum enim Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire; quemadmodum Christus venit, ut salvum faceret, quod perierat, et filios Dei, qui erant dispersi, congregaret in unum: ita Ecclesia, a Deo populorum mater et magistra constituta, omnibus debitorum se novit, ac lapsos erigere, labantes sustinere, reverteres amplecti, confirmare bonos et ad meliora provehere parata semper et intenta est. Quapropter nullo tempore a Dei veritate, quæ sanat omnia, testanda et prædicanda quiescere potest, sibi dictum esse non ignorans: Spiritus meus, qui est in te, et verba mea, quæ posui in ore tuo, non recedent de ore tuo amodo et usque in sempiternum.

Nos itaque, inherentes prædecessorum nostrorum vestigiis, pro supremo nostro Apostolico munere veritatem Catholicam docere ac tæri perverasque doctrinas reprobare nunquam intermissimus. Nunc autem,

Christian religion, and denying the true God and his Christ, the minds of many have sunk into the abyss of Pantheism, Materialism, and Atheism, until, denying rational nature itself, and every sound rule of right, they labor to destroy the deepest foundations of human society.

Unhappily, it has yet further come to pass that, while this impiety prevailed on every side, many even of the children of the Catholic Church have strayed from the path of true piety, and by the gradual diminution of the truths they held, the Catholic sense became weakened in them. For, led away by various and strange doctrines, utterly confusing nature and grace, human science and divine faith, they are found to deprave the true sense of the doctrines which our holy Mother Church holds and teaches, and endanger the integrity and the soundness of the faith.

Considering these things, how can the Church fail to be deeply stirred? For, even as God wills all men to be saved, and to arrive at the knowledge of the truth, even as Christ came to save what had perished, and to gather together the children of God who had been dispersed, so the Church, constituted by God the mother and teacher of nations, knows its own office as debtor to all, and is ever ready and watchful to raise the fallen to support those who are falling, to embrace those who return, to confirm the good and to carry them on to better things. Hence, it can never forbear from witnessing to and proclaiming the truth of God, which heals all things, knowing the words addressed to it: 'My Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, from henceforth and forever.'

We, therefore, following the footsteps of our predecessors, have never ceased, as becomes our supreme Apostolic office, from teaching and defending Catholic truth, and condemning doctrines of error. And now, with

sedentibus nobiscum et iudicantibus universi orbis Episcopis, in hanc œcumenicam Synodum auctoritate nostra in Spiritu Sancto congregatis, innixi Dei verbo scripto et tradito, prout ab Ecclesia Catholica sancte custoditum et genuine expositum accepimus, ex hac Petri Cathedra, in conspectu omnium, salutarem Christi doctrinam profiteri et declarare constituimus, adversus erroribus potestate nobis a Deo tradita proscriptis atque damnatis.

CAPUT I.

De Deo rerum omnium Creatore.

Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia credit et confitetur, unum esse Deum verum et vivum, Creatorem ac Dominum cœli et terre, omnipotentem, æternum, immensum, incomprehensibilem, intellectu ac voluntate omnique perfectione infinitum; qui cum sit una singularis, simplex omnino et incommutabilis substantia spiritualis, prædicandus est re et essentia a mundo distinctus, in se et ex se beatissimus, et super omnia, quæ præter ipsum sunt et concipi possunt, ineffabiliter excelsus.

Hic solus verus Deus bonitate sua et omnipotenti virtute non ad augendam suam beatitudinem, nec ad acquirendam, sed ad manifestandam perfectionem suam per bona, quæ creaturis impertitur, liberrimo consilio simul ab initio temporis utramque de nihilo condidit creaturam, spirituales et corporales, angelicam videlicet et mundanam, ac deinde humanam quasi communem ex spiritu et corpore constitutam.

Universa vero, quæ condidit, Deus providentia sua tuetur atque gubernat, attingens a fine usque ad finem fortiter, et disponens omnia suaviter, Omnia ediri nuda et aperta sunt

the Bishops of the whole world assembled round us, and judging with us, congregated by our authority, and in the Holy Spirit, in this œcumenical Council, we, supported by the Word of God written and handed down as we received it from the Catholic Church, preserved with sacredness and set forth according to truth, have determined to profess and declare the salutary teaching of Christ from this Chair of Peter, and in sight of all, proscribing and condemning, by the power given to us of God, all errors contrary thereto.

CHAPTER I.

Of God, the Creator of all Things.

The holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church believes and confesses that there is one true and living God, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, almighty, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intelligence, in will, and in all perfection, who, as being one, sole, absolutely simple and immutable spiritual substance, is to be declared as really and essentially distinct from the world, of supreme beatitude in and from himself, and ineffably exalted above all things which exist, or are conceivable, except himself.

This one only true God, of his own goodness and almighty power, not for the increase or acquirement of his own happiness, but to manifest his perfection by the blessings which he bestows on creatures, and with absolute freedom of counsel, created out nothing, from the very first beginning of time, both the spiritual and the corporeal creature, to wit, the angelical and the mundane, and afterwards the human creature, as partaking, in a sense, of both, consisting of spirit and of body.

God protects and governs by his providence all things which he hath made, "reaching from end to end mightily, and ordering all things sweetly." For "all things are bare

oculis ejus ea etiam, quæ libera creaturarum actione futura sunt.

CAPUT II.

De Revelatione.

Eadem sancta mater Ecclesia tenet et docet, Deum, rerum omnium principium et finem, naturali humanæ rationis lumine e rebus creatis certo cognosci posse; invisibilia enim ipsius, a creatura mundi, per ea quæ facta sunt, intellecta, conspiciuntur: attamen placuisse ejus sapientiæ et bonitati, alia, eaque supernaturali via se ipsum ac æternæ voluntatis suæ decreta humano generi revelare, dicente Apostolo: Multifariam, multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in Prophetis: novissime, diebus istis locutus est nobis in Filio.

Huius divinæ revelationi tribuendum quidem est, ut ea, quæ in rebus divinis humanæ rationi per se impervia non sunt, in præsentì quoque generis humani conditione ab omnibus expedite, firma certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint. Non hac tamen de causa revelatio absolute necessaria dicenda est, sed quia Deus ex infinita bonitate sua ordinavit hominem ad finem supernaturalem, ad participanda scilicet bona divina quæ humanæ mentis intelligentiam omnino superant; siquidem oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, quæ præparavit Deus illis, qui diligunt illum.

Hæc porro supernaturalis revelatio, secundum universalis Ecclesiæ fidem a sancta Tridentina Synodo declaratam, continetur in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dicente quasi per manus traditæ ad nos usque pervenerunt. Qui quidem ve-

and open to his eyes," even those which are yet to be by the free action of creatures.

CHAPTER II.

Of Revelation.

The same holy Mother Church holds and teaches that God, the beginning and end of all things, may be certainly known by the natural light of human reason, by means of created things; "for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made," but that it pleased his wisdom and bounty to reveal himself, and the eternal decrees of his will, to mankind by another and a supernatural way: as the Apostle says, "God, having spoken on divers occasions, and many ways, in times past, to the Fathers by the prophets; last of all, in these days, hath spoken to us by his Son."

It is to be ascribed to this divine revelation, that such truths among things divine as of themselves are not beyond human reason, can, even in the present condition of mankind, be known by every one with facility, with firm assurance, and with no admixture of error. This, however, is not the reason why revelation is to be called absolutely necessary: but because God of his infinite goodness has ordained man to a supernatural end, viz., to be a sharer of divine blessings, which utterly exceed the intelligence of the human mind, for "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him."

Further, this supernatural revelation, according to the universal belief of the Church, declared by the sacred Synod of Trent, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions which have come down to us having been received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself; or from the Apostles themselves, by the

teris et Novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ejusdem Concilii decreto recensentur, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis suscipiendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo, quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati; nec ideo dumtaxat, quod revelationem sine errore contineant, sed propeterea, quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt.

Quoniam vero, quae sancto Tridentina Synodus de interpretatione divinae Scripturae ad coercenda petulantia ingenia salubriter decrevit, a quibusdam hominibus prave exponuntur, nos, idem decretum renovantes, hanc illius mentem esse declaramus, ut in rebus fidei et morum, ad edificationem doctrinae Christianae pertinentium, is pro vero sensu sacrae Scripturae habendus sit, quem tenuit ac tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum; atque ideo nemini licere contra hunc sensum aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari.

CAPUT III.

De Fide.

Quum homo a Deo tamquam Creatore et Domino suo totus dependeat, et ratio creata, increatae veritati penitus subjecta sit, plenum revelanti Deo intellectus et voluntatis obsequium fide prestare tenemur. Hanc vero fidem, quae humanae salutis initium est, Ecclesia Catholica profitetur,

dictationem of the Holy Spirit, have been transmitted, as it were, from hand to hand. And these books of the Old and New Testament are to be received as sacred and canonical, in their integrity, with all their parts, as they are enumerated in the decree of the said Council, and are contained in the ancient Latin edition of the Vulgate. These the church holds to be sacred and canonical, not because, having been carefully composed by mere human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain revelation, with no admixture of error; but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been delivered as such to the Church herself.

And as the things which the holy Synod of Trent decreed for the good of souls concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture, in order to curb rebellious spirits, have been wrongly explained by some, we, renewing the said decree, declare this to be their sense, that, in matters of faith and morals, appertaining to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which our holy Mother Church hath held and holds, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scripture; and therefore that it is permitted to no one to interpret the Sacred Scripture contrary to this sense, nor, likewise, contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

CHAPTER III.

On Faith.

Man being wholly dependant upon God, as upon his Creator and Lord, and created reason being absolutely subject to uncreated truth, we are bound to yield to God, by faith in his revelation, the full obedience of our intelligence and will. And the Catholic Church teaches that this faith,

virtutem esse supernaturalem, qua, Dei aspirante et adjuvante gratia, ab eo revelata vera esse credimus, non propter intrinsicam rerum veritatem naturam rationis lumine perspectam, sed propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revalantis, qui nec falli nec fallere potest. Est enim fides, testantur Apostolo, sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium.

Ut nihilominus fidei nostrae obsequium rationi consentaneum esset, voluit Deus cum internis Spiritus Sancti auxiliis externa junxi revelationis sue argumenta, facta scilicet divina, atque imprimis miracula et prophetias, quae cum Dei omnipotentiam et infinitam scientiam luculenter commonstrant, divinae revelationis signa sunt certissima et omnium intelligentiae accommodata. Quare tum Moyses et Prophetae, tum ipse maxime Christus Dominus multa et manifestissima miracula et prophetias ediderunt; et de Apostolis legimus: Illi autem perfecti praedicaverunt ubique, Domino cooperante et sermonem confirmante sequentibus signis. Et rursum scriptum est; Habemus firmiorem propheticum sermonem, cui bene facitis attendentes quasi lucernae lucenti in caliginoso loco.

Licet autem fidei assensus nequam sit motus animi caecus: nemo tamen evangelicae praedicationi consentire potest, sicut oportet ad salutem consequendam, absque illuminatione et inspiratione Spiritus Sancti, qui dat omnibus suavitatem in consentiendo et credendo veritati. Quare fides ipsa in se, etiam si per caritatem non operetur, donum Dei est, et actus ejus est opus ad salutem pertinens, quo homo liberam praestat ipsi Deo obedientiam, gratiae ejus, cui resistere posset, consentiendo et cooperando.

which is the beginning of man's salvation, is a supernatural virtue, whereby, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, we believe that the things which he has revealed are true; not because of the intrinsic truth of the things viewed by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God himself, who reveals them, and who can neither be deceived nor deceive. For faith, as the Apostle testifies, is "the substance of things hoped for, the conviction of things that appear not."

Nevertheless, in order that the obedience of our faith might be in harmony with reason, God willed that to the interior help of the Holy Spirit there should be joined exterior proofs of his revelation; to wit, divine facts, and especially miracles and prophecies, which, as they manifestly display the omnipotence and infinite knowledge of God, are most certain proofs of his divine revelation, adapted to the intelligence of all men. Wherefore, both Moses and the Prophets, and, most especially, Christ our Lord himself showed forth many and most evident miracles and prophecies; and of the Apostles we read:—"But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed." And again, it is written: "We have the more firm prophetic word, whereunto you do well to attend, as to a light shining in a dark place."

But though the assent of faith is by no means a blind action of the mind, still no man can assent to the Gospel teaching, as is necessary to obtain salvation, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who gives to all men sweetness in assenting to and believing in the truth. Wherefore, faith itself, even when it does not work by charity, is in itself a gift of God, and the act of a faith is work appertaining to salvation, by which man yields voluntary obedience to God himself, by assenting to and co-operating with his grace, which he is able to resist.

Porro fide divina et Catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quæ in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, et ab Ecclesia sive solemnî iudicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio tamquam divinitus revelata credenda proponuntur.

Quoniam vero sine fide impossibile est placere Deo, et ad filiorum ejus consortium pervenire; ideo nemini unquam sine illa contigit justificatio, nec alius, nisi in ea perseveraverit usque in finem, vitam æternam assequetur. Ut autem officio veram fidem amplectendi, in eaque constanter perseverandi satisfacere possemus, Deus per Filium suum unigenitum Ecclesiam instituit suæque institutionis manifestis notis instruxit, ut ea tamquam custos et magistra verbi revelati ab omnibus posset agnoscî. Ad solam enim Catholicam Ecclesiam ea pertinent omnia, quæ ad evidentem fidei Christianæ credibilitatem tam multa et tam mira divinitus sunt disposita. Quin etiam Ecclesia per se ipsa, ob suam nempe admirabilem propagationem, eximiam sanctitatem et inexhaustam in omnibus bonis fecunditatem, ob Catholicam unitatem, invictamque stabilitatem, magnum quodam et perpetuum est motivum credibilitatis et divinæ suæ legationis testimonium irrefragabile.

Quo fit, ut ipsa veluti signum levatum in nationes, et ad se invitet, qui nondum crediderunt, et filios suos certiores faciat, firmissimo niti fundamento fidem, quam profitentur. Cui quidem testimonio efficax subsidium accedit ex superna virtute. Etenim benignissimus Dominus et errantes gratia sua excitat atque adjuvat, ut ad agnitionem veritatis venire possint, et eos, quos de tenebris transtulit in admirabile lumen suum, in hoc eodem lumine ut perseverent, gratia sua confirmat, non deserens, nisi deseratur. Quocirca minime par est conditio eorum, qui per celestem fidem donum Catholicæ veritatis adhaeserunt,

Further, all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the Word of God, written or handed down, and which the Church, either by a solemn judgment, or by her ordinary and universal magisterium, proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed.

And since, without faith, it is impossible to please God, and to attain to the fellowship of his children, therefore without faith no one has ever attained justification, nor will any one obtain eternal life unless he shall have persevered in faith unto the end. And, that we may be able to satisfy the obligation of embracing the true faith, and of constantly persevering in it, God has instituted the Church through his only-begotten Son, and has bestowed on it manifest notes of that institution, that it may be recognized by all men as the guardian and teacher of the revealed Word; for to the Catholic Church alone belong all those many and admirable tokens which have been divinely established for the evident credibility of the Christian faith. Nay, more, the Church, by itself, with its marvelous extension, its eminent holiness, and its inexhaustible fruitfulness in every good thing, with its Catholic unity and its invincible stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefutable witness of its own divine mission.

And thus, like a standard set up unto the nations, if both invites to itself those who do not yet believe, and assures its children that the faith which they profess rests on the most firm foundation. And its testimony is efficaciously supported by a power from on high. For our most merciful Lord gives his grace to stir up and to aid those who are astray, that they may come to a knowledge of the truth; and to those whom he has brought out of darkness into his own admirable light, he gives his grace to strengthen them to persevere in that light, deserting none who desert not him. Therefore there is no parity between

atque eorum, qui ducti opinionibus humanis, falsam religionem sectantur; illi enim, qui fidem sub Ecclesie magisterio susceperunt, nullam unquam habere possunt justam causam mutandi, aut in dubium fidem eandem revocandi. Quæ cum ita sint, gratias agentes Deo Patri, qui dignos nos fecit in partem sortis sanctorum in lumine, tantam ne negligamus salutem, sed aspicientes in auctorem fidei et consummatorem Jesum, teneamus spei nostre confessionem indeclinabilem.

CAPUT. IV.

De Fide et Ratione.

Hoc quoque perpetuus Ecclesie Catholice consensus tenuit et tenet, duplicem esse ordinem cognitionis, non solum principio, sed objecto etiam distinctum: principio quidem, quia in altero naturali ratione, in altero fidei divina cognoscimus; objecto autem, quia præter ea, ad quæ naturalis ratio pertingere potest, credenda nobis proponuntur mysteria in Deo abscondita, quæ, nisi revelata divinitus, innotescere non possunt. Quocirca Apostolus, qui a gentibus Deum per ea, quæ facta sunt, cognitum esse testatur, disserens tamen de gratia et veritate, quæ per Jesum Christum facta est, pronunciat: Loquimur Dei sapientiam in mysterio, quæ abscondita est, quam prædestinavit Deus ante sæcula in gloriam nostram, quam nemo principum hujus sæculi cognovit: nobis autem revelavit Deus per Spiritum suum: Spiritus enim omnia scrutatur, etiam profunda Dei. Et ipse Unigenitus confitetur Patri, quia abscondit hæc a sapientibus et prudentibus, et revelavit ea parvulis.

Ac ratio quidem fide, illustrata cum sedulo, pie et sobrie querit, aliquam Deo dante, mysteriorum intelligen-

the condition of those who have adhered to the Catholic truth by the heavenly gift of faith, and of those who, led by human opinions, follow a false religion; for those who have received the faith under the magisterium of the Church can never have any just cause for changing or doubting that faith. Therefore, giving thanks to God the Father who has made us worthy to be partakers of the lot of the Saints in light, let us not neglect so great salvation, but with our eyes fixed on Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering.

CHAPTER IV.

Our Faith and Reason.

The Catholic Church, with one consent, has also ever held and does hold that there is a twofold order of knowledge distinct both in principle and also in object; in principle, because our knowledge in the one is by natural reason, and in the other by divine faith; in object, because, besides those things to which natural reason can attain, there are proposed to our belief mysteries hidden in God, which, unless divinely revealed, can not be known. Wherefore, the Apostle, who testifies that God is known by the Gentiles through created things, still, when discoursing of the grace and truth which come by Jesus Christ, says: "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew . . . but to us God hath revealed them by his Spirit. For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." And the only-begotten Son himself gives thanks to the Father, because he has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them to little ones.

Reason, indeed, enlightened by faith, when it seeks earnestly, piously and calmly, attains by a gift from

those who have ad-
holic truth by the
faith, and of those
opinions, follow a
those who have re-
er the magisterium
n never have any
nging or doubting
ore, giving thanks
who has made us
akers of the lot of
let us not neglect
but with our eyes
author and finisher
hold fast the con-
without wavering.

IV.

d) Reason.

ch, with one con-
ld and does hold
d order of know-
n principle and
nciple, because
one is by natural
other by divine
se, besides those
ral reason can
osed to our be-
in God, which,
ed, can not be
ne Apostle, who
known by the
d things, still,
he grace and
Jesus Christ,
wisdom of God
which is hid-
ed before the
which none of
knew . . . but
d them by his
searcheth all
ings of God."
Son himself
ther, because
from the wise
revealed them

ightened by
stly, piously
a gift from

tiam eamque fructuosissimam asso-
quirit, tum ex eorum, quæ naturaliter
cognoscit, analogia, tum e mysterio-
rum ipsorum nexu inter se et cum
fine hominis ultimo; nunquam tamen
idonea redditur ad ea perspicienda
instar veritatum, quæ proprium ipsius
objectum constituunt. Divina enim
mysteria suapte natura intellectum
creatum sic excedunt, ut etiam revel-
atione tradita et fide suscepta, ipsius
tamen fidei velamine contexta et
quodam quasi caligine obvoluta mane-
ant, quamdiu in hac mortali vita
peregrinamur a Domino: per fidem
enim ambulamus, et non per speciem.

Verum etsi fides sit supra ra-
tionem, nulla tamen unquam inter
fidem et rationem vera dissensio esse
potest: cum idem Deus, qui mysteria
revelat et fidem infundit, animo
humano rationis lumen indiderit.
Deus autem negare seipsum non po-
sit, nec verum vero unquam contra-
dicere. Inanis autem hujus contra-
dictionis species inde potissimum ori-
tur, quod vel fidei dogmata ad men-
tem Ecclesiæ intellecta et exposita
non fuerint, vel opinionum commenta
pro rationis effatis habeantur. Om-
nem igitur assertionem veritati illum-
inatæ fidei contrariam omnino falsam
esse definimus. Porro Ecclesia, quæ
una cum apostolico munere docendi,
mandatum accepit fidei depositum
custodiendis jus etiam et officium
divinitus habet falso nominis scien-
tiam proscribendi, ne quis decipiatur
per philosophiam et inanem fallaci-
am. Quapropter omnes Christiani
fideles hujusmodi opiniones, quæ fidei
doctrinæ contrariæ esse cognoscuntur,
maxime si ab Ecclesia reprobate
fuerint, non solum prohibentur tan-
quam legitimas scientiæ conclusiones
defendere, sed pro erroribus potius,
qui fallacem veritatis speciem præ se
ferant, habere tenentur omnino.

God some, and that a very fruitful,
understanding of mysteries; partly
from the analogy of those things
which it naturally knows, partly from
the relations which the mysteries
bear to one another and to the last
end of man; but reason never be-
comes capable of apprehending mys-
teries as it does those truths which
constitute its proper object. For the
divine mysteries by their own nature
so far transcend the created intelli-
gence that, even when delivered by
revelation and received by faith, they
remain covered with the veil of faith
itself, and shrouded in a certain de-
gree of darkness, so long as we are
pilgrims in this mortal life, not yet
with God; "for we walk by faith and
not by sight."

But though faith is above reason,
there can never be any real discrep-
ancy between faith and reason, since
the same God who reveals mysteries
and infuses faith has bestowed the
light of reason on the human mind;
and God can not deny himself, nor
can truth ever contradict truth. The
false appearance of such a contradic-
tion is mainly due, either to the dog-
mas of faith not having been under-
stood and expounded according to the
mind of the Church, or to the inven-
tions of opinion having been taken for
the verdicts of reason. We define,
therefore, that every assertion con-
trary to a truth of enlightened faith is
utterly false. Further, the Church,
which, together with the Apostolic
office of teaching, has received a
charge to guard the deposit of faith,
derives from God the right and the
duty of proscribing false science, lest
any should be deceived by philosophy
and vain fallacy. Therefore all faith-
ful Christians are not only forbidden
to defend, as legitimate conclusions of
science, such opinions as are known
to be contrary to the doctrines of faith,
especially if they have been con-
demned by the Church, but are alto-
gether bound to account them as
errors which put them on the fallaci-
ous appearance of truth.

Neque solum fides et ratio inter se discedere nunquam possunt, sed opem quoque sibi mutuam ferunt, cum recta ratio fidei fundamenta demonstret, ejusque lumine illustrata rerum divinarum scientiam exolat; fides vero rationem ab erroribus liberet ac tueatur, eamque multiplici cognitione instruat. Quapropter tantum abest, ut Ecclesia humanarum artium et disciplinarum culture obsistat, ut hanc multis modis juvet atque provoveat. Non enim commoda ab iis ad hominum vitam dimanantia aut ignorat aut despicit; fatetur imo, eas, quemadmodum a Deo, scientiarum Domino, protectæ sunt, ita si rite pertractentur, ad Deum, juvante ejus gratia, perducere. Nec sane ipsa vetat, ne hujusmodi disciplinæ in suo quæque ambitu propriis utantur principiis et propria methodo; sed justam hanc libertatem agnoscens, id sedulo cavet, ne divinæ doctrinæ repugnando errores in se suscipiant, aut fines proprios transgressæ, ea, quæ sunt fidei, occupent et perturbent.

Neque enim fidei doctrina, quam Deus revelavit, velut philosophicum inventum proposita est humanis ingeniis perficienda, sed tanquam divinum depositum Christi Sponsæ tradita, fideliter custodienda et infalliter declaranda. Hinc sacrorum quoque dogmatum is sensus perpetuo est retinendus, quem semel declaravit sancta mater Ecclesia, nec unquam ab eo sensu, altioris intelligentiæ specie et nomine, recedendum. Crescat igitur et multum vehementerque proficiat, tam singulorum, quam omnium, tam unius hominis, quam totius Ecclesiæ, ætatem ac sæculorum gradibus, intelligentia, scientia, sapientia; sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententia.

And not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they are of mutual aid one to the other; for right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by its light, cultivates the science of things divine; while faith frees and guards reason from errors, and furnishes it with manifold knowledge. So far, therefore, is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human arts and sciences, that it in many ways helps and promotes it. For the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits of human life which result from the arts and sciences, but confesses that, as they came from God, the Lord of all science, so, if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of his grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere should make use of its own principles and its own method; but, while recognizing this just liberty, it stands watchfully on guard, lest sciences, setting themselves against the divine teaching, or transgressing their own limits, should invade and disturb the domain of faith.

For the doctrine of faith which God hath revealed has not been proposed, like a philosophical invention, to be perfected by human ingenuity, but has been delivered as a divine deposit to the Spouse of Christ, to be faithfully kept and infallibly declared. Hence, also, that meaning of the sacred dogmas is perpetually to be retained which our holy mother the Church has once declared; nor is that meaning ever to be departed from, under the pretense or pretext of a deeper comprehension of them. Let, then, the intelligence, science, and wisdom of each and all, of individuals and of the whole Church, in all ages and at all times, increase and flourish in abundance and vigor; but simply in its own proper kind, that is to say, in one and the same doctrine, one and the same sense, one and the same judgment.

CANONES.

I.

De Deo rerum omnium Creatore.

1. Si quis unum verum Deum visibilium et invisibilium Creatorem et Dominum negaverit; anathema sit.

2. Si quis præter materiam nihil esse affirmare non erubuerit; anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, unam eandemque esse Dei et rerum omnium substantiam vel essentiam; anathema sit.

4. Si quis dixerit, res finitas, tum corporeas tum spirituales aut saltem spirituales, e divina substantia emanasse; aut divinam essentiam sui manifestatione vel evolutione fieri omnia; aut denique Deum esse ens universale sue indefinitum, quod sese determinando constituat rerum universitatem in genera, species et individua distinctam; anathema sit.

5. Si quis non confiteatur, mundum, resque omnes, quæ in eo continentur et spirituales et materiales, secundum totam suam substantiam a Deo ex nihilo esse productas; aut Deum dixerit non voluntate ab omni necessitate libera, sed tam necessario creasse, quam necessario amat seipsum; aut mundum ad Dei gloriam conditum esse negaverit; anathema sit.

II.

De Revelatione.

1. Si quis dixerit, Deum unum et verum, Creatorem et Dominum nostrum, per ea, quæ facta sunt, naturali rationis humanæ lumine certo cognosci non posse; anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, fieri non posse, aut non expedire ut per revelationem divinam homo de Deo cultuque ei

CANONS.

II.

Of God, the Creator of all Things.

1. If any one shall deny one true God, Creator and Lord of things visible and invisible: let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall not be ashamed to affirm that, except matter, nothing exists: let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall say that the substance and essence of God and all things is one and the same: let him be anathema.

4. If any one shall say that finite things, both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the divine substance; or that the divine essence by the manifestation and evolution of itself becomes all things; or, lastly, that God is universal or indefinite being, which by determining itself constitutes the universality of things, distinct according to genera, species, and individuals: let him be anathema.

5. If any one confess not that the world, and all things which are contained in it, both spiritual and material, have been, in their whole substance, produced by God out of nothing; or shall say that God created, not by his will, free from all necessity, but by a necessity equal to the necessity whereby he loves himself; or shall deny that the world was made for the glory of God: let him be anathema.

II.

Of Revelation.

1. If any one shall say that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, can not be certainly known by the natural light of human reason through created things: let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall say that it is impossible or inexpedient that man should be taught by divine revelation

exhibendo edoceatur: anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, hominem ad cognitionem et perfectionem, quæ naturalem superet, divinitus evehi non posse, sed ex seipso ad omnis tandem veri et boni possessionem juri profectu pertingere posse et debere: anathema sit.

4. Si quis sacra Scripturæ libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos sancta Tridentina Synodus recensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitus inspiratos esse negaverit: anathema sit.

III.

De Fide.

1. Si quis dixerit, rationem humanam ita independentem esse, ut fides ei a Deo imperari non possit: anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, fidem divinam a naturali de Deo et rebus moralibus scientia non distinguere, ac propterea ad fidem divinam non requiri, ut revelata veritas propter auctoritatem Dei revelantis credatur: anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, revelationem divinam externis signis credibilem fieri non posse, ideoque sola interna cujusque experientia aut inspiratione privata homines ad fidem moveri debere: anathema sit.

4. Si quis dixerit, miracula nulla fieri posse, proindeque omnes de iis narrationes, etiam in sacra Scriptura contentas, inter fabulas vel mythos ablegandas esse; aut miracula certo cognosci nunquam posse, nec iis divinam religionis Christianæ originem rite probari: anathema sit.

5. Si quis dixerit, assensum fidei Christianæ non esse liberum, sed argumentis humanæ rationis necessario

concerning God and the worship to be paid to him: let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall say that man can not be raised by divine power to a higher than natural knowledge and perfection, but can and ought, by a continuous progress, to arrive at length, of himself, to the possession of all that is true and good: let him be anathema.

4. If any one shall not receive as sacred and canonical the books of Holy Scripture, entire with all their parts, as the holy Synod of Trent has enumerated them, or shall deny that they have been divinely inspired: let him be anathema.

III.

On Faith.

1. If any one shall say that human reason is so independent that faith can not be enjoined upon it by God: let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall say that divine faith is not distinguished from natural knowledge of God and of moral truths, and therefore that it is not requisite for divine faith that revealed truth be believed because of the authority of God, who reveals it: let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall say that divine revelation can not be made credible by outward signs, and therefore that men ought to be moved to faith solely by the internal experience of each, or by private inspiration: let him be anathema.

4. If any one shall say that miracles are impossible, and therefore that all the accounts regarding them, even those contained in Holy Scripture, are to be dismissed as fabulous or mythical; or that miracles can never be known with certainty, and that the divine origin of Christianity can not be proved by them: let him be anathema.

5. If any one shall say that the assent of Christian faith is not a free act, but inevitably produced by the

and the worship to let him be anathema. shall say that man by divine power to natural knowledge and can and ought, by a process, to arrive at it, to the possession of it and good: let him

shall not receive as canonical the books of scripture with all their Synod of Trent has or shall deny that divinely inspired: anathema.

II.

Faith.

shall say that human independent that faith upon it by God: anathema.

shall say that divine revealed from natural and of moral law that it is not faith that revealed because of the law reveals it: let

shall say that divine law be made credible and therefore that law to faith solely because of each, or law: let him be

shall say that miracles therefore that all things them, even by Scripture, are fabulous or mythical can never be true, and that the certainty can not be: let him be

shall say that the law is not a free produced by the

produci; aut ad solam fidem vivam, quæ per caritatem operatur, gratiam Dei necessariam esse: anathema sit.

6. Si quis dixerit, parum esse conditionem fidelium atque eorum, qui ad fidem unice veram nondum pervenerunt, ita ut Catholici justam causam habere possint, fidem, quam sub Ecclesiæ magisterio jam susceperunt, assensu suspensio in dubium vocandi, donec demonstrationem scientificam credibilitatis et veritatis fidei suæ absolverint: anathema sit.

IV.

De Fidei Ratione.

1. Si quis dixerit, in revelatione divina nulla vera et proprie dicta mysteria contineri, sed universa fidei dogmata posse per rationem rite ex cultam et naturalibus principiis intelligi et demonstrari: anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, disciplinas humanas ea cum libertate tractandas esse, ut earum assertiones, etsi doctrinæ revelatæ adversentur, tanquam veræ retineri, neque ab Ecclesiâ prescribi possint: anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, fieri posse, ut dogmatibus ab Ecclesiâ propositis, aliquando secundum progressum scientiæ sensus tribuendus sit alius ab eo, quem intellexit et intelligit Ecclesiâ: anathema sit.

Itaque supremi pastoralis Nostri officii debitum exequentes, omnes Christi fideles, maxime vero eos, qui præsumunt vel docendi munere funguntur, per viscera Jesu Christi obtestamur, neque ejusdem Dei et Salvatoris nostri auctoritate jubemus, ut ad hos errores a Sancta Ecclesiâ arcendos et eliminandos, atque purissimæ fidei lucem pandendam studium et operam conferant.

arguments of human reason; or that the grace of God is necessary for that living faith only which worketh by charity: let him be anathema.

6. If any one shall say that the condition of the faithful, and of those who have not yet attained to the only true faith, is on a par, so that Catholics may have just cause for doubting, with suspended assent, the faith which they have already received under the magisterium of the Church, until they shall have obtained a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their faith: let him be anathema.

IV.

On Faith and Reason.

1. If any one shall say that in divine revelation there are no mysteries, truly and properly so called, but that all the doctrines of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles, by properly cultivated reason: let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall say that human sciences are to be so freely treated that their assertions, although opposed to revealed doctrine, are to be held as true, and can not be condemned by the Church: let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall assert it to be possible that sometimes, according to the progress of science, a sense is to be given to doctrines propounded by the Church different from that which the Church has understood and understands: let him be anathema.

Therefore, we, fulfilling the duty of our supreme pastoral office, entreat, by the mercies of Jesus Christ, and, by the authority of the same, our God and Saviour, we command, all the faithful of Christ, and especially those who are set over others, or are charged with the office of instruction, that they earnestly and diligently apply themselves to ward off and eliminate these errors from holy Church, and to spread the light of

Quoniam vere satis non est, hereticam pravitatem evitare, nisi ii quoque errores diligenter fugiantur, qui ad illam plus minusve accedunt; omnes officii monemus, servandam Constitutiones et Decreta, quibus prave ejusmodi opiniones, quæ isthic diserte non enumerantur, ab hac Sancta Sede proscriptæ et prohibita sunt.

Datum Romæ in publica Sessione in Vaticana Basilica solemniter celebrata, anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo octingentesimo septuagesimo, die vigesima quarta Aprilis. Pontificatus Nostri anno vigesimo quarto.

CONSTITUTIO DOGMATICA PRIMA DE
ECCLESIA CHRISTI.

*Edita in Sessione Quarta Sacrosancti
Ecumenici Concilii Vaticani.*

PIUS EPISCOPUS, SERVUS SERVORUM DEI
SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO AD PER-
PETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Pastor æternus et Episcopus animarum nostrarum, ut salutarum Redemptionis opus perenne redderet, sanctam ædificare Ecclesiam decrevit, in qua veluti in domo Dei viventis fideles omnes unius fidei et caritatis vinculo continerentur. Quapropter, priusquam clarificaretur, rogavit Patrem non pro Apostolis tantum, sed et pro eis, qui credituri erant per verbum eorum in ipsum, ut omnes unum essent, sicut ipse Filius et Pater unum sunt. Quemadmodum igitur Apostolos, quos sibi de mundo elegerat, misit, sicut ipse missus erat a Patre: ita in Ecclesia sua pastores et doctores usque ad consummationem sæculi esse voluit. Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset, et per coherentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, beatum Petrum cæteris Apostolis præpon-

pure faith, unless by such heretical pravity, unless those errors also be diligently avoided which more or less nearly approach it, we admonish all men of the further duty of observing those constitutions and decrees by which such erroneous opinions as are not here specifically enumerated, have been proscribed and condemned by this Holy See.

Given at Rome in public Session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the twenty-fourth day of April, in the twenty-fourth year of our Pontificate.

FIRST DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON
THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

*Published in the Fourth Session of the
holy Ecumenical Council of the Va-
tican.*

PIUS BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS
OF GOD, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE
SACRED COUNCIL, FOR AN EVERLAST-
ING REMEMBRANCE.

The eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls, in order to continue for all time the life-giving work of his Redemption, determined to build up the holy Church, wherein, as in the house of the living God, all who believe might be united in the bond of one faith and one charity. Wherefore before he entered into his glory, he prayed unto the Father, not for the Apostles only, but for those also who through their preaching should come to believe in him, that all might be one even as he the son and Father are one. As then he sent the Apostles whom he had chosen to himself from the world, as he himself had been sent by the Father: so he willed that there should ever be pastors and teachers in his Church to the end of the world. And in order that the Episcopate also might be one and undivided, and that by means of a closely

not sufficient to shun
unless those errors
avoided which more
reach it, we admon-
the further duty of
constitutions and
such erroneous
not here specifically
e been proscribed
this Holy See.
in public Session
the Vatican Basilica
Lord one thousand
seventy, on the
of April, in the
of our Pontificate.

CONSTITUTION ON OF CHRIST.

Fourth Session of the
Council of the Va-

OF THE SERVANTS
APPROVAL OF THE
FOR AN EVERLAST-

r and Bishop of
continue for all
work of his Re-
t to build up the
as in the house
all who believe
the bond of one
Wherefore be-
his glory, he
er, not for the
those also who
ag should come
t all might be
and Father are
t the Apostles
o himself from
self had been
he willed that
tors and teach-
the end of the
that the Epi-
ne and undi-
s of a closely

ens in ipso instituit perpetuum utri-
usque unitatis principium ac visibile
fundamentum, super cuius fortitudi-
nem æternum extrueretur templum,
et Ecclesiæ cælo inferenda sublimitas
in huius fidei firmitate consurgeret.
Et quoniam portæ inferi ad everten-
dam, si fieri posset, Ecclesiam, contra
ejus fundamentum divinitus positum
majori in dies odio undique insur-
gunt, Nos ad Catholici gregis cus-
todiam, incolumitatem, augmentum,
necessarium esse judicamus, sacro ap-
probante Concilio, doctrinam de in-
stitutione, perpetuitate ac natura
sacri Apostolici primatus, in quo
totius Ecclesiæ vis ac soliditas
consistit, cunctis fidelibus credendam
et tenendam, secundum antiquam
atque constantem universalis Ecclesiæ
fidem, proponere, atque contrarios,
dominico gregi adeo perniciosos, er-
rores proscribere et condemnare.

CAPUT I.

*De Apostolici Primatus in beato Petro
institutione.*

Docemus itaque et declaramus, jux-
ta Evangelii testimonia primatum
jurisdictionis in universam Dei Eccle-
siam immediate et directe beato Petro
Apostolo promissum atque collatum
a Christo Domino fuisse. Unum
enim Simonem, cui jam pridem dixe-
rat: Tu vocaberis Cephas, postquam
ille suam edidit confessionem in-
quiens: Tu es Christus, Filius Dei
vivi, solemnibus his verbis allocutus
est Dominus: Beatus es, Simon Bar-
Jona, quia caro et sanguis non revel-
avit tibi, sed Pater meus, qui in cælis
est: et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Pe-
trus, et super hanc Petram ædificabo
Ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferi non

united priesthood the multitude of the
faithful might be kept secure in the
oneness of faith and communion, he
set blessed Peter over the rest of the
Apostles, and fixed in him the abiding
principle of this twofold unity, and its
visible foundation, in the strength of
which the everlasting temple should
arise, and the Church in the firmness
of that faith should lift her majestic
front to Heaven. And seeing that
the gates of hell, with daily increase of
hatred, are gathering their strength
on every side to upheave the founda-
tion laid by God's own hand, and so,
if that might be, to overthrow the
Church: we, therefore, for the pre-
servation, safe-keeping, and increase
of the Catholic flock, with the approval
of the sacred Council, do judge it to
be necessary to propose to the belief
and acceptance of all the faithful, in
accordance with the ancient and con-
stant faith of the universal Church,
the doctrine touching the institution,
perpetuity and nature of the sacred
Apostolic Primacy, in which is found
the strength and solidity of the entire
Church, and at the same time to pro-
scribe and condemn the contrary
errors so hurtful to the flock of Christ.

CHAPTER I.

*Of the Institution of the Apostolic Pri-
macy in blessed Peter.*

We therefore teach and declare that,
according to the testimony of the
Gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction
over the universal Church of God
was immediately and directly pro-
mised and given to blessed Peter the
Apostle by Christ the Lord. For it
was to Simon alone, to whom he had
already said: "Thou shalt be called
Cephas," that the Lord after the con-
fession made by him, saying: "Thou
art the Christ, the Son of the living
God," addressed these solemn words:
"Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona,
because flesh and blood have not re-
vealed it to thee, but my Father who
is in heaven. And I say to thee that

prævalebunt adversus eam: et tibi dabo claves regni: quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in coelis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in coelis. Atque uni Simoni Petro contulit Jesus Post suam resurrectionem summi pastoris et rectoris jurisdictionem in totum suum ovile dicens: *Pasce agnos meos: Pasce oves meas:* Huic tam manifestæ sacrarum Scripturarum doctrine, ut ab Ecclesia Catholica semper intellecta est, aparte opponuntur præve eorum sententiæ, qui, constitutam a Christo Domino in sua Ecclesia regiminis formam pervertentes, negant, solum Petrum præ cæteris Apostolis, sive seorsum singulis sive omnibus simul, vero proprioque jurisdictionis primatu fuisse a Christo instructum; aut qui affirmant, eundem primatum non immediate directeque ipsi beato Petro, sed Ecclesie, et per hanc illi ut ipsius Ecclesie ministro delatum fuisse.

Si quis igitur dixerit, beatum Petrum Apostolum non esse a Christo Domino constitutum Apostolorum omnium principem et totius Ecclesie militantis visibile caput; vel eundem honoris tantum, non autem veræ propriæque jurisdictionis primatum ab eodem Domino nostro Jesu Christo directe et immediate accepisse; anathema sit.

CAPUT II.

De perpetuitate Primatus beati Petri in Romanis Pontificibus.

Quod autem in beato Apostolo Petro princeps pastorum et pastor magnus ovium Dominus Christus Jesus in perpetuam salutem ac perenne bonum Ecclesie instituit, id eodem auctore in Ecclesia, quæ fundata super petram ad finem sæculorum usque firma stabit,

thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." And it was upon Simon alone that Jesus after his resurrection bestowed the jurisdiction of chief pastor and ruler over all his fold in the words: "Feed my lambs; feed my sheep." At open variance with this clear doctrine of Holy Scripture as it has been ever understood by the Catholic Church are the perverse opinions of those who, while they distort the form of government established by Christ the Lord in his Church, deny that Peter in his single person, preferably to all the other Apostles, whether taken separately or together, was endowed by Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction; or of those who assert that the same primacy was not bestowed immediately and directly upon blessed Peter himself, but upon the Church, and through the Church on Peter as her minister.

If any one, therefore, shall say that blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed the Prince of all the Apostles and the visible Head of the whole Church Militant; or that the same directly and immediately received from the same our Lord Jesus Christ a primacy of honor only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction: let him be anathema.

CHAPTER II.

On the Perpetuity of the Primacy of blessed Peter in the Roman Pontiffs.

That which the Prince of Shepherds and great Shepherd of the sheep, Jesus Christ our Lord, established in the person of the blessed Apostle Peter to secure the perpetual welfare and lasting good of the Church; must, by the same institution necessarily re-

and upon this rock I
Church, and the gates
prevail against it,
to thee the keys of
heaven. And what-
soever thou shalt bind on earth, it
shall be bound in heaven; and
whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth,
it shall also be loosed in heaven."

Simon alone that
resurrection bestowed
of chief pastor and
fold in the words:
"I will feed my sheep."
With this clear doc-
trine as it has been
by the Catholic
opinions of
they distort the form
published by Christ
Church, deny that
person, preferably
Apostles, whether
together, was en-
titled a true and pro-
priation; or of
at the same pri-
vilege immediately
blessed Peter him-
self the Church, and
on Peter as her

one, shall say that
the Church was not ap-
pointed all the Apostles
of the whole
Church, that the same
privilege received
by the Lord Jesus Christ
only, and not of
the Church: let him

II.

the Primacy of
the Roman Pontiff.

of Shepherds
of the sheep,
established in
the Apostle Peter
for the welfare and
of the Church; must, by
necessity, re-

jugiter durare necesse est. Nulli sane
dubium, imo sæculis omnibus notum
est, quod sanctus beatissimusque
Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput
fideique columna, et Ecclesie Ca-
tholicæ fundamentum, a Domino nos-
tro Jesu Christo Salvatore humani
generis ac Redemptore, claves regni
accepit: qui ad hoc usque tempus et
semper in suis successoribus episcopis
sanctæ Romanæ Sedis, ab ipso fun-
data ejusque consecratæ sanguine,
vivit et præsidet et judicium exercet.
Unde quicumque in hac Cathedra
Petro succedit, is secundum Christi
ipsius institutionem primatum Petri
in universam Ecclesiam obtinet.
Manet ergo dispositio veritatis, et
beatus Petrus, in accepta fortitudine
petræ perseverans, suscepta Ecclesie
gubernacula non reliquit. Hæc de
causa ad Romanum Ecclesiam propter
potentiorum principatatem necesse
semper fuit omnem convenire Ecclesiam,
hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique
fideles, ut in ea Sede, e qua venerandæ
communions jura in omnes cùmmanant,
tamquam membra in capite conso-
ciata, in unam corporis compagem
coalescerent.

Si quis ergo dixerit, non esse ex
ipsius Christi Domini institutione, seu
jure divino, ut beatus Petrus in pri-
matu super universam Ecclesiam
habeat perpetuos successores; aut
Romanum Pontificem non esse beati
Petri in eodem primatu successorem;
anathema sit.

CAPUT III.

De vi et ratione Primatus Romani
Pontificis.

Quapropter apertis innixi sacrarum
litterarum testimoniis, et inherentes
tum Prædecessorum Nostrorum Rom-

main unceasingly in the Church;
which, being founded upon the Rock,
will stand firm to the end of the
world. For none can doubt, and it is
known to all ages, that the holy and
blessed Peter, the Prince and Chief of
the Apostles, the pillar of the faith
and foundation of the Catholic Church,
received the keys of the kingdom from
our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and
Redeemer of mankind, and lives, pre-
sides, and judges, to this day and
always, in his successors the Bishops of
the Holy See of Rome, which was
founded by him, and consecrated by
his blood. Whence, whosoever suc-
ceeds to Peter in this See, does by the
institution of Christ himself obtain the
Primacy of Peter over the whole
Church. The disposition made by
Incarnate Truth therefore remains,
and blessed Peter, abiding through
the strength of the Rock in the power
that he received, has not abandoned
the direction of the Church. Where-
fore it has at all times been necessary
that every particular Church—that is
to say, the faithful throughout the
world—should agree with the Roman
Church, on account of the greater
authority of the principedom which this
has received; that all being associated
in the unity of that See whence the
rights of communion spread to all,
might grow together as members of
one Head in the compact unity of the
body.

If then, any should deny that it is
by the institution of Christ the Lord,
or by divine right, that blessed Peter
should have a perpetual line of suc-
cessors in the Primacy over the uni-
versal Church, or that the Roman
Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter
in this primacy: let him be anathema.

CHAPTER III.

On the Power and Nature of the Pri-
macy of the Roman Pontiff.

Wherefore, resting on plain testi-
monies of the Sacred Writings, and
adhering to the plain and express

anorum Pontificum, tum Conciliorum generalium disertis perspicuisque decretis, innovamus œcumenici Concilii Florentini definitionem, qua credendum ab omnibus Christi fidelibus est, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem, et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri, principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesie caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum Conciliorum et sacris canonibus continetur.

Docemus proinde et declaramus, Ecclesiam Romanam, disponente Domino, super omnes alias ordinariæ potestatis obtinere principatum, et hanc Romani Pontificis jurisdictionis potestatem, quæ vere episcopalis est immediatam esse: erga quam cujuscumque ritus et dignitatis pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchiæ subordinationis veræque obediendi quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent; ita ut, custodita cum Romano Pontifice tam communionis quam ejusdem fidei professionis unitate, Ecclesiæ Christi sit unus grex sub uno summo pastore. Hæc est Catholice veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare salva atque salute nemo potest.

Tantum autem abest, ut hæc Summi Pontificis potestas officiat ordinariæ ac immediatæ illi episcopalis jurisdictionis potestati, qua Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tamquam veri pastores assignatos sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut

decrees both of our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, and of the General Councils, we renew the definition of the œcumenical Council of Florence, in virtue of which all the faithful of Christ must believe that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff possesses the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and is the true vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church, and father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was given to him in blessed Peter to rule, feed, and govern the universal Church by Jesus Christ our Lord; as is also contained in the acts of the General Councils and in the sacred Canons.

Hence we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor through the preservation of unity both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation.

But so far is this power of the Supreme Pontiff from being any prejudice to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which Bishops, who have been sent by the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles, feed and govern, each his own flock, as true

eadem a supremo et universali Pastore asseratur, roboretur ac vindicetur, secundum illud sancti Gregorii Magni: *Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesie. Meus honor fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*

Porro ex suprema illa Romani Pontificis potestate gubernandi universam Ecclesiam jus eidem esse consequitur, in huius sui muneris exercitio libere communicandi cum pastoribus et gregibus totius Ecclesie, ut iidem ab ipso in via salutis doceri ac regi possint. Quare damnamus ac reprobamus illorum sententias, qui hanc supremi capitis cum pastoribus et gregibus communicationem licite impediri posse dicunt, aut eandem reddunt seculari potestati obnoxiam, ita ut contendant, quæ ab Apostolica Sede vel ejus auctoritate ad regimen Ecclesie constituuntur, vim ac valorem non habere nisi potestatis secularis placito confirmentur.

Et quoniam divino Apostolici primatus jure Romanus Pontifex universæ Ecclesie præest, docemus etiam et declaramus, eum esse judicem supremum fidelium, et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius posse judicium recurri; Sedis vero Apostolicæ, cujus auctoritate major non est, judicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de ejus licere judicare judicio. Quare a recto veritatis tramite aberrant, qui affirmant, licere ab judiciis Romanorum Pontificum ad œcumenicum Concilium tamquam ad auctoritatem Romano Pontifice superiorem appellare.

Si quis itaque dixerit, Romanum Pontificem habere tantummodo officium inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatem jurisdictionis, in universam Eccle-

pastorum, that this their episcopal authority is really asserted, strengthened, and protected by the supreme and universal Pastor; in accordance with the words of St. Gregory the Great: "My honor is the honor of the whole Church. My honor is the firm strength of my brethren. I am truly honored when the honor due to each and all is not withheld."

Further, from this supreme power possessed by the Roman Pontiff of governing the universal Church, it follows that he has the right of free communication with the pastors of the whole Church, and with their flocks, that these may be taught and ruled by him in the way of salvation. Wherefore we condemn and reject the opinions of those who hold that the communication between the supreme head and the pastors and their flocks can lawfully be impeded; or who make this communication subject to the will of the secular power, so as to maintain that whatever is done by the Apostolic See, or by its authority, for the government of the Church, can not have force or value unless it be confirmed by the assent of the secular power.

And since by the divine right of Apostolic primacy the Roman Pontiff is placed over the universal Church, we further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may re-open the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgment. Wherefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiffs to œcumenical Councils, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff.

If, then, any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only

siam, non solum in rebus, quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in his, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffuse pertinent; aut tunc habere tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem hujus supremæ potestatis; aut hanc ejus potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles: anathema sit.

CAPUT IV.

De Romani Pontificis infallibile magisterio.

Ipsa autem Apostolico primatu, quem Romanus Pontifex, tamquam Petri principis Apostolorum successor, in universam Ecclesiam obtinet, supremam quoque magisterii potestatem comprehendendi, hæc Sancta Sedes semper tenuit, perpetuus Ecclesiæ usus comprobatur, ipsaque oecumenica Concilia, ea imprimis, in quibus Oriens cum Occidente in fidei caritatisque unionem conveniebat, declaraverunt. Patres enim Concilii Constantinopolitani quarti, majorum vestigiis inherentes, hanc solemnem ediderunt professionem: Prima salus est, rectæ fidei regulam custodire. Et quia non potest Domini nostri Jesu Christi prætermitti sententia dicentis: Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, hæc, quæ dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica immaculata est semper Catholica reservata religio, et sancta celebrata doctrina. Ab hujus ergo fide et doctrina separari minime cupientes, speramus, ut in una communione, quam Sedes Apostolica prædicat, esse mereamur, in qua est integra et vera Christianæ religionis soliditas. Approbante vero Lugdunensi Concilio secundo, Græci professi sunt: Sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam Catholicam obtinere, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro, Apostol-

in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fullness of this supreme power; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the churches, and over each and all the pastors and the faithful: let him be anathema.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff.

Moreover, that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church confirms, and oecumenical Councils also have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ can not be passed by, who said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," these things which have been said are approved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion and her holy and well-known doctrine has always been kept undefiled. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion. And, with the approval of the Second Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed that the holy Roman Church enjoys supreme and full

belong to faith and those which relate to the government of the church throughout the world; that he possesses the full and entire part, and not all the supreme power; which he enjoys is not immediate, both in the churches, and in the pastors and the people, but anathema.

R IV.

Illegible Teaching of Pontiff.

the supreme power included in the which the Roman precessor of Peter, s, possesses over is Holy See has etual practice of and oecumenical lared, especially at with the West ith and charity. e Fourth Coun- following in the decessors, gave ssion : The first ssion is to keep the

And because
rd Jesus Christ
he said: "Thou
his rock I will
se things which
ved by events,
tolle See the
her holy and
s always been
ng, therefore,
gree separated
ne of that See,
erve to be in
ich the Apos-
which is the
of the Chris-
t the approval
f Lyons, the
holy Roman
e and full

orum principe sive vertice, cujus Romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recipias veraciter et humiliter recognoscit; et sicut præ cæteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, sic et, si quæ de fide suborta fuerint questiones, suo debent iudicio definiri. Florentinum denique Concilium definivit: Pontificem Romanum, verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesie caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.

Huic pastorali muneri ut satisfacerent, Prædecessores Nostri indefessam semper operam dederunt, ut salutaris Christi doctrina apud omnes terræ populos propagaretur, parique cura vigilarent, ut, ubi recepta esset, sincera et pura conservaretur. Quocirca totius orbis Antistites, nunc singuli, nunc in Synodis congregati, longam ecclesiarum consuetudinem et antiquæ regule formam sequentes, ea præsertim pericula, quæ in negotiis fidei emergebant, ad hanc Sedem Apostolicam retulerunt, ut ibi potissimum resarcirentur damna fidei, ubi fides non potest sentire defectum. Romani autem Pontificis, prout temporum et rerum conditio suadebat, nunc convocationis œcumenicis Conciliis aut explorata Ecclesiæ per orbem dispersæ sententia, nunc per Synodos particularis, nunc aliis, quæ divina suppeditebat providentia, adhibitis auxiliis, ea tenenda de finiverunt, quæ sacris Scripturis et apostolicis traditionibus consentanea, Deo adjutore, cognoverant. Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut, eo assistente, traditam per Apostolos revelationem sensu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent. Quorum qui

primacy and pre-eminence over the whole Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the plenitude of power from our Lord himself in the person of blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is ; and as the Apostolic See is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so also, if any question regarding faith shall arise, they must be defined by its judgment. Finally, the Council of Florence defined : That the Roman Pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians ; and that to him in blessed Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church.

To satisfy this pastoral duty, our predecessors ever made unwearied efforts that the salutary doctrine of Christ might be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care watched that it might be preserved genuine and pure where it had been received. Therefore the Bishops of the whole world, now singly, now assembled in Synod, following the long-established custom of churches, and the form of the ancient rule, sent word to this Apostolic See of those dangers especially which sprang up in matters of faith, that there the losses of faith might be most effectually repaired where the faith can not fail. And the Roman Pontiff, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling oecumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognized as conformable with the sacred Scriptures and Apostolic traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by his revelation they might make known new doctrine; but

dem apostolicam doctrinam omnes venerabiles Patres amplexi et sancti doctores orthodoxi venerati atque secuti sunt; plenissime scientes, hanc sancti Petri Sedem ab omni semper errore illibatam permanere, secundum Domini Salvatoris nostri divinam pollicitationem discipulorum suorum principi factum; Ego rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.

Huc igitur veritatis et fidei numquam deficientis charisma Petro ejusque in hac Cathedra successoribus divinitus collatum est, ut excelso suo munere in omnium salutem fungerentur, ut universus Christi grex per eos ab erroris venenosa esca aversus, cœlestis doctrinæ pabulo nutriretur, ut, sublata schismatis occasione, Ecclesia tota una conservaretur, atque suo fundamento innixa, firma adversus inferi portas consisteret.

At vero cum hac ipsa ætate, qua salutifera Apostolici muneris efficacia vel maxime requiritur, non pauci inveniantur, qui illius auctoritati obtreçant; necessarium omnino esse censemus, prærogativam, quam unigenitus Dei Filius cum summo pastoralis officio conjungere dignatus est, solemniter asserere.

Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christianæ exordio perceptæ fideliter inhærendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis Catholicæ exaltationem et Christianorum populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum pastoris et doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere,

that by his assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And, indeed, all the venerable Fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have venerated and followed, their Apostolic doctrine; knowing most fully that this See of Holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of his disciples: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren."

This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by heaven upon Peter and his successors in this chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine; that the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell.

But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority, we judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouchsafed to join with the supreme pastoral office.

Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine

qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesie, irreformabiles esse.

assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not from the consent of the Church.

Si quis autem huic Nostræ definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat, presumpserit: anathema sit.

But if any one—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition: let him be anathema.

Datum Romæ, in publica Sessione in Vaticana Basilica solemniter celebrata, anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo octingentesimo septuagesimo, die decima octava Julii. Pontificatus Nostri anno vigesimo quinto.

Given at Rome in public Session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

they might in-
fully expound
sit of faith de-
apostles. And,
le Fathers have
noly orthodox
and followed,
ine; knowing
of Holy Peter
all blemish of
divine promise
r made to the
"I have pray-
h fail not, and,
d, confirm thy

uth and never-
red by heaven
cessors in this
perform their
vation of all;
f Christ, kept
the poisonous
nourished with
doctrine; that
eing removed,
t be kept one,
dation, might
ates of hell.
age, in which
the Apostolic
quired, not a
away from its
it altogether
sert the pre-
begotten Son
join with the

adhering to
from the be-
an faith, for
viour, the ex-
religion, and
u people, the
ng, we teach
gma divinely
man Pontiff,
dra, that is,
the office of
l Christians,
ne Apostolic
doctrine re-
o be held by
y the divine